

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

DEC 8 1943

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND POLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

OCTOBER, 1943

Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:

ARTICLES

Liberation

The Fall, and the Unconscious

The South India Scheme of Union

Shakespeare's Last Phase

Is God Neutral?

A Centenary Appreciation of
Southey's *Life of Wesley*

The Social Consequences of Town
Planning

The Biblical Roots of International
Law

Unrealized Ideals

G. K. Chesterton: The Man and his
Work

R. Martin Pope, M.A. B.D.

R. Scott Frayn, B.A. B.D. Ph.D.

Richard Pyke

Frederick C. Gill, M.A.

W. H. Stubbs, B.A.

Samuel Davis

Henry J. Crone, P.A.S.I.

E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D.

John T. Newton

Frank H. Lowther

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

Chalmers and the Disruption

Christianity and Bolshevism

Revival in Germany

Education in Empire

A. W. Harrison, M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D.

C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

A Refugee

Address of F. B. Halim to the Empire
Society

Mr. Seys: A Footnote to the His-
tory of the Wesleyan Methodist
Missionary Society

J. S. Boulton

Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., D.D.

W. E. Farndale

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

MINISTERS IN COUNCIL

RECENT LITERATURE

MY BOOKSHELF C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS
EDGAR·C·BARTON

25·35·CITY ROAD·E·C·1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

Advisory Council:

EDGAR C. BARTON

WILBERT F. HOWARD, M.A.,
D.D.

ARCHIBALD W. HARRISON,
M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D.

W. LANSDELL WARDLE, M.A.,
D.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 2s. 6d. a copy (postage 3d.) or 10s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35, City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Legacies

- ★ Seventy-four years ago the National Children's Home received its first legacy in the touching gift of a little girl, who left the contents of her money-box.
- ★ Since that day many have remembered the Home when making their wills, and so have made possible its great work of helping needy children.
- ★ This is one of the many ways of helping the Children's Home, and the suggestion is put forward in the hope it may appeal to those readers of the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* who are in a position to respond. The Principal will be very pleased to send fuller information on request.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME AND ORPHANAGE

CHIEF OFFICES: Highbury Park, London, N.5



T
ack
of t
title
Rev
ent
con
nar
asp
her
whi
cata
he
asp
e
he
con
has
no
gosp
ins
It
cle
that
nth
am
ife
mp
He
at th
o t
Eph
info
Ger
nhu
lav
their
C

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

OCTOBER, 1943

LIBERATION

THE world conflict with which we are still preoccupied awakens in all thoughtful minds visions of a new order of human existence which will acknowledge and embody certain principles of the Christian ideal arising out of the atoning work of Christ. One of these was set forth by the writer under the title 'Reconciliation' in an article appearing in the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, October issue 1941. Later he was interested to find that in his treatise entitled *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, Dr. Vincent Taylor had made Reconciliation the basis of his view of the purpose of the Atonement. On the other hand, Dr. Wheeler Robinson in his *Redemption and Revelation* has set forth another aspect of the same doctrine by adopting redemption deliberately as the central theme of his book on the ground that it avoids 'the ambiguity of reconciliation which can permit (though not when given the New Testament context of *katallagē*) a moral influence theory of the Atonement'. Without entering on the delicate task of estimating the relative values of the subjective and objective aspects of the death of Christ, it may at least be suggested that the spirit of man is enriched by all views of the act of God revealed in the death of His Son on the Cross. The idea of a suffering God was alien to early Christian thought and continued so to be throughout the ages to many thinkers. But this *a priori* view has no support in New Testament teaching. A God remote from mankind with no share in its suffering is a philosophic abstraction alien to the spirit of the Gospel, which proclaims in Christ the essential kinship of God with man and a kinship which involves suffering.

If we turn therefore to the concept of Ransom as indicating emancipation or release from the power of sin and a purely selfish way of life, we have to note that the term redemption (*apolutrōsis*) used by St. Paul (Romans iii. 24, 1 Corinthians i. 30; Ephesians i. 7; Colossians i. 14) takes us back to our Lord's familiar words concerning the Ransom (*lutron*), proclaiming that He gives His life a ransom 'for many' (Matthew xx. 28, and Mark x. 45). This does not imply a sacrifice in our stead but a giving up of His life on behalf of many lives. He came not only to proclaim deliverance to the captives, but to set them free at the price of His own life. Captivity under all conditions is a deadly experience to those who are not 'past feeling' (a Pauline expression: see for its context Ephesians iv. 19). One has but to recall the experience of meeting some of those unfortunate people who at the outbreak of the last war just failed to escape from Germany and were interned for four weary years, not indeed to be subjected to inhuman treatment but to have their life plans interrupted and to be withdrawn from family and friends — an experience which was to leave marks upon their physical and mental being, never to be forgotten or entirely healed.

Christ then is our Redeemer, but not in the sense of the word found in the

familiar passage of Job (xix. 25), 'I know that my Redeemer liveth' where the Hebrew, which usually signifies one who sets free from bondage, exile and the like, means a Vindicator who will attest his innocence. The Greek term is *lutrôtes*, One who gives His life as a ransom to deliver mankind. It is remarkable that this title is not found in the New Testament except in one passage (Acts vii. 35), where it refers to Moses. It is found in Justin Martyr, but other Greek Christian writers did not use it. But when we reach the fourth century, the age of the Vulgate, we find that Jerome and Augustine adopted it in the Latin form *Redemptor* which was henceforth to hold an established place in the literature, liturgies and hymnology of the Western Church. One experiences a sort of thrill in coming across *Redemptor* in the Psalms of the Vulgate as if the New Testament had been miraculously anticipated in these hymns of the Jewish Church. In Christian hymnology Ambrose is the first to use it. It appears in the second verse of the hymn *Intende qui regis Israel* when he invokes the Son of God as *redemptor gentium* with the vision of a missionary of the Gospel. The title has become familiar to generations of Christians from its frequent use in the ecstatic hymns of John and Charles Wesley and Isaac Watts.

It is therefore to St. Paul that we owe the word redemption as an extension of our Lord's teaching concerning the 'ransom'. Redemption is in effect liberation from captivity and slavery, a state of bondage. We recall also the teaching of Jesus in his conversation with the believing Jews in the fourth gospel (John viii. 31-36), who misunderstood His statement that the truth would make them free. The freedom He spoke of was freedom from sin. And this was to be the oft-repeated and indeed vital teaching of St. Paul who as a citizen of the Roman Empire knew what slavery was and gave us the word Redemption (*apolutrôsis*). Slavery under certain conditions might mean a position of comfort and even honour as a trusted servant of a humane and enlightened citizen, but it was always slavery. The apostle in his counsels to masters and slaves places the mutual relationship on a Christian basis of forbearance, goodwill and fidelity to the spirit of the Gospel and urges Philemon to treat the restored deserter, Onesimus, as more than a slave, 'a brother beloved'. As a Roman citizen, St. Paul was also acquainted with the custom of manumission described so graphically by Deissmann in his *St. Paul* (E.T. p. 150), by which the slave is purchased by a deity: 'the owner comes with the slave to the temple, sells him there to the god and receives from the treasury the purchase money which the slave has previously deposited there out of his savings. The slave thus becomes the property of the god, but as against all the world he is a free man'. So the Christian is a bondman (*doulos* E.T. 'servant') of, and incorporate with, Christ. The Corinthian converts have been 'bought with a price' unto the liberty of the children of God. The freedom is the restoration of a lost status to be enjoyed here and now, while they wait for the 'redemption of the body' in a life beyond the grave. This spiritual freedom may co-exist with every kind of material disadvantage, ills of the flesh and ills of the social order, and indeed may be made perfect through them. The freedom to be won for tortured and depressed populations is one of the great aims of the present war, and rightly so, for it is based on the teaching of Christ which begins with the individual soul and its endless worth. The Jews who were children of Abraham, ignoring the facts of history from the captivity of Egypt onwards, boasted that they had never

been in bondage, but they had missed the significance of His appeal (see John viii. 34-38). It was their souls that He was probing to the depths and they knew not that they were siding with the enemies of the Truth and refusing the new liberty which He was to win for them by His death. Later they were to witness the terrible consequences of their hostility in the death of Jesus by crucifixion. But from the first He had the premonition that He must suffer many things in order that the cause of spiritual liberation could be won. A young man, Teacher and Leader of a group of young men, He 'set His face to go to Jerusalem'. He was ready to meet death because it was the will of His Father, and that was final. To-day we are witnessing the calling up of youth to take their share in the struggle for universal liberty. In the consecration of Jesus to the task of remaking humanity we behold the true motive of the soldier's obedience to the call of service. It is not the glamour of a dangerous adventure or military glory, but service for the deliverance of the world from the evil of oppression, ruthless national ambition, the policy of imperial expansion regardless of the rights of others and the enslavement of the defeated.

Let it be granted that in this world human existence has always been a struggle and that the individual man cannot escape tribulation. The author of *Midnight Hour* writes 'Christianity announces the redemption through death by sacrifice not only of man but of the world. The life of the world, like the life of a man, must be lost, mortified, crucified that it may be saved to "life eternal"'. Not individual man in isolation but man in and with the world is the subject of Christ's salvation.' He suggests that a mere languid and self-centred 'pietism' may lose sight of the needs of mankind. But it is the appeal of Christ crucified to the individual that always has been and ever will be the very core of the Christian gospel, and however hopeless and abandoned he may be, he can find in it an unfailing source of hope and a new found freedom.

To-day through the discoveries and triumphs of science the world has contracted and by the conquest of the air distance has been annihilated. No region lies outside the scope and benefits of civilization. The missionary problem of distance and transport has been immeasurably lightened, but its divinely appointed task of preaching the gospel to every creature remains. And while the cosmic significance of the Love of Christ is an enduring conviction, it is likewise true that in the soul of the individual the liberating power of His sacrifice must be experienced. Redemption not merely from the guilt of past sins, but from despair of the future of mankind must begin in the soul of the penitent, who utters the prayer of Charles Wesley's hymn

Is there a thing beneath the sun
That strives with Thee my heart to share?
Ah, tear it thence and reign alone
The Lord of every motion there:
Then shall my heart from earth be free
When it hath found repose in Thee.

Thus it is to humble and adoring faith that the Cross of Christ effects release from the bondage of self. How subtle selfishness can be! And how easy to excuse oneself and find a score of reasons for inaction, when duty suggests the surrender of our wishes, hopes and ambition for a nobler life! But all experience proves

that 'none of us liveth to himself' and only by self-surrender do we enter upon the real freedom in a world in which we are members one of another. It is no easy lesson to learn, but the whole Christian Church, divided though it be by differences of organization and order, is one in its belief in the redemption wrought for all mankind by Christ and Him crucified. It ensures to the soul of man a new emancipation and withal the promise of a new order of life for all nations as for the individual. The exploitation of weak and backward peoples by sheer force of arms in order to satisfy the dream of an expanding empire, with new opportunities for trade and self-enrichment on behalf of civilized nations, is to be ruled out in the interests of humanity as a whole. It is only in the acknowledgment of the rights of the human race as a family to fair treatment in that spirit of brotherhood and goodwill which will mete out justice to all that are oppressed, and lift them to higher levels of living, that war will be brought to an end and peace and goodwill established on earth.

We cannot doubt that this is the will of the Creator Who revealed His love for mankind in the gift of His Son who came to deliver man 'from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God'. It remains for man to respond to the Deliverer in the spirit of self-surrender and to receive the forgiveness of sins. The claims of the post-war world will offer a new opportunity for the exercise of mercy. The sufferings of persecuted peoples, Jews, Poles and Czechs, not to dwell on the privations and miseries suffered by subject countries, Jugo-Slavs, Greeks, Norsemen, Dutchmen and others, cry aloud to the lovers of righteousness. If retribution be exacted for proved acts of cruelty and murder perpetrated on defenceless individuals, the Love of God will equally call upon us to forsake the selfish aims and policies which even in Christian communities have been blind to social inequalities and misery. In his recently published autobiography (see *Fate has been Kind* p. 210 f.), Mr. F. W. Pethick Lawrence, who has travelled widely and in his public life has been devoted to the pursuit of social and political reform, concludes with a reference to the Eastern law of Karma, the inevitable law of cause and consequence, and adds a timely reference to the doctrine of the Christian faith, that is, the forgiveness of sins. 'Neither is the law of cause and effect a punishment, nor the Christian gospel of forgiveness an escape from consequences. Repentance is the spiritual prerogative of redemption, and here lies the powerful ethical value of the forgiveness of sins'. This is a timely reminder that the Love of God is the final law of experience and had provided a way of liberation for the individual soul and the world.

We may place by the side of this testimony the profoundly moving self-revelation of the late C. F. Andrews, whose devoted life in India will be recalled as we read in his brief but penetrating study, *The Sermon on the Mount*, his experience of 'a forgiveness deep as the ocean, wide as the blue sky, unfathomable in its depths of divine love, a spirit of redeeming love around and about and within me that has gone on to this day. In Christ God Himself had become human and personal and real: His love had become real and personal also'.

In the end therefore, as all the experience of the Christians in every age shows, liberation from the tragedy of a selfish life arises from the conviction of the individual soul, wrought by penitence, faith and personal surrender to the love of God as revealed in His Son Who loved us and gave Himself for us.

Here then is the liberty of the glory of God which opens before us the vision of a new order for the nations as for the individual. The exploitation of backward peoples and the lust of conquest by sheer force to satisfy military ambition is to be ruled out of the human family. A redeemed universe founded on the spirit of brotherhood and goodwill with peace on earth is the ultimate goal which may seem to be a 'far off divine event' to all but the saints of Christ, who (to quote Henry Vaughan)

Are that Citie's shining spires
We travell to.

R. MARTIN POPE

THE FALL, AND THE UNCONSCIOUS¹

FOR our purpose there are two settings of what is known as the 'Fall of Man' in the literature of the Old Testament. Only one of these, however, is usually consulted in discussion of the theory. The first and most obvious origin of the doctrine is the story of the Garden of Eden. The other is the story of the tower of Babel. The theme is the same in both cases. It is the scale which is different. In fairness, neither story can really be described as a 'Fall'. As the stories are actually told they are stories of a revolt. They are instances of rebellion. There is definite incitement to revolt. In the case of Eden the serpent is the arch conspirator. In the case of Babel, the incitement is not treated mythologically. It comes from the spirit of Man. The scene of one is simplicity itself. It is the tragedy of a garden. The scene of the other is some more ample plain 'in the land of Shinar'. The one is reminiscent of agriculture. The other is in the setting of primitive architecture and city building. The Eden story is cast in the mould of individualism. The other has its obvious sense of community or communities. If the Eden story brings a confusion of evil into the family of man, as man, the Babel story advances the theme into another proportion, to account for the distracting divisions among the wider growing communities. The theme, however, is the same.

The literature of the Old Testament, especially in its more primitive records, it will be noticed, is written from a very disarmingly impersonal standpoint. In that respect it represents a literary convention sometimes supposed to have originated with the modern novel. The novel is said to have struck a unique point of view, being that of the unseen but ubiquitous and even omniscient author. But these records are also written after the same manner. They are written from the point of view of someone just as entirely on the scene or behind the scenes, ubiquitous, omniscient and psychologically pervasive, if we may so speak. The Creation story, for instance, is written as though some conscious personality were on the spot at the time. Someone, so to speak, seems to have been hidden in the darkness and the chaos, and his mentality is, in that particular place, obviously anachronistic. It is this unseen narrator who seems to see the chaos gradually resolve into cosmos, the light flare-up at the voice of God, the mist arise to refresh the ground, the waters gather and distribute, and the evening and the morning turn about him in the skies. He is hidden in the Garden and spies upon the builders of the Tower of Babel, overhears the con-

¹ A paper read to the Oxford University Socratic Club, May 17, 1943.

course of the inventors and sees the grand convulsion at the end. So, in addition to these stories, it is the view-point of this impersonal watcher that we require to explore.

We must probably allow also for a process of growth in these stories in spite of their apparent unity and completeness. Folk tales of this kind may be composite, not only in their elements but in their authorship. The incident may not be one, or two, and the authorship need not be single in either case. We were present on an interesting occasion at a recital of vocal and instrumental music in Morocco. On asking the guide what the performers were singing, we were told that it was history — Moorish History. From the looks of the performers, however, their noddings and nudgings, we formed the opinion that there were some brilliant improvisations made upon the very instant. No doubt the truth and moral of the history were not materially impaired, but rather enhanced from their immediate point of view and for their purpose — so long as it all revolved about the things most surely believed, anyhow.

Allowing therefore for a growing theme and an association of narrators, these particular stories represent the growth of primitive story rather than single pieces by single authors. And if that be so, we should look for a primitive theme and view-point rather than peddle with the particulars. It is probable that if we analysed psychology down to its most single and primitive content, what we really should arrive at would be an elementary feeling of discomfort alternating with an equally elementary feeling of satisfaction. Whether it be the first being with any claim at all to intelligence, or a lusty infant making its first conscious respiration, the feeling would be the same. It is this — shall we say 'complex'? — which, differentiated in many directions, develops into the manifold feeling of life. Differentiated, developing in scale, higher and lower (we may say), this initial quality passes from what we call mere physical condition (if there ever is such!) to mental condition, and thence to moral and spiritual quality of higher life.

We do not therefore envisage our unseen author as primarily, — primitively, if you like — concerned with such conscious themes as free-will, choice, or sin and judgment, but with a very elementary speculative notion upon life in general. He has an ideal of life, of some sort, but reality is not like it. So of behaviour. We cannot believe that the tellers of these stories ever believed in the literal accuracy of their details. Literalism is, at all events, at a very elementary stage, surely. The thought here is only roughly of a factual order. In some senses because of that the stories are the more true. In some senses they are less. Our idea of fact is more academic and abstract, therefore it can be distorted in some ways, or even emasculated. Theirs was rich and generous rather than exact. It was not yet the fact bleached of colour, emotion and imagination. They said here what they wanted to, in both these stories, but they are speculative rather than categorical. While there may be reminiscences of actual gardens, trees and their fruits, towers, labour, invention, language and so forth, they are but the furniture and framework for the truth they want to tell — or upon which, as we should prefer to put it, they speculate in their own warm, human, primitively picturesque and poetic vein.

What then is the truth they want to tell? As we put it, the life-problem is fundamentally 'discomfort'. Experience for these people is somehow incom-

plete, unsatisfying. Primitive man is psychologically discrepant. Personality does not fit life. Life does not fit personality. Life is not right. It is not good enough. In fact it is inexpressibly nasty here and there. How is the fact to be stated and accounted for?

Now let us remember that the tellers of these stories have to cover not only the vague discrepancy which may be the most primitive emotion, but also the more positive evil at the other end of the scale as they see it. Do not overlook the fact that while our narrator is telling the story of human revolt, he is not in revolt himself. He certainly has a theory that the labour of life is a penal consequence of revolt, but the revolt is not his. He explains all the trouble and dissatisfaction of life in terms of a revolt for which he does not seem to accept any responsibility at all. His theory of evil, however, has more to cover than his own case. It must be sufficient to account for the heavy end of the scale as well as the light. He must cover the wickedness as well as the weakness, the sinfulness of others as well as his own dissatisfaction. We may not be quite sure that he expected us to discover his own attitude, but this is it and it is quite plain. To span all this, however, the story or stories — of Eden and Babel — are not stories of a lapse or a fall, but stories of defiance and revolt. For, as we have said already, they are not stories of a mere rift, a lapse or a fall, they are stories of a revolution.

It is probably right to say that theology has never taken these stories at their face value in this respect — *pace*, Milton. Theology has used even a euphemistic title, 'The Fall of Man'. But theology has expounded the case as a revolt, none the less. It has expounded the extreme rather than the mean. It has indeed standardized the extreme. On the other hand, what we have to do with is this initial sense of discrepancy. It arises in the mentality of the narrator, or narrators of these stories before ever it can arise from the stories themselves. That this discrepancy is thus enlarged to revolt is partly accounted for by the primitive dramatization of the theme, and partly because, as we have seen, the narrators must use the greater to include the less.

The inquiry that we make now is therefore this. Are we to suppose that sin begins in this world with this initial impudence and revolt? In passing, we may freely say that if it is said to arise in the other world, and among the angels, we only remit the problem. And, in either case, is this revolt a treachery disclosed upon the serene heights of perfect being? Once again let us refer to the inspired, unseen humanity which is the narrator. His sympathies are obviously with the Deity who is flouted, not with Man who rebels. We shall recall how in *Paradise Lost* there is said to be an unconscious shifting of dramatic or artistic sympathy. But there is no such shift here. If we get that into it it must be mostly imported, anyhow. We are free to say, however, that if the story is to be taken literally, we cannot resist old Omar:

Oh, Thou, who Man of baser earth didst make
And who with Eden didst devise the snake;
For all the sin wherewith the Face of Man
Is blacken'd, Man's forgiveness give — and take.

Our unseen narrator has not this bias, anyhow. He writes without any weakness for Man, almost as though he had no human sympathy. He is also pessi-

mistic, in regarding all the effort and strife of life as penal consequence of revolt and rebellion. In this respect he is — or they are — the rigid righteous, and the same theme is debated later, from another point of view perhaps, in the Book of Job.

The theory we have advanced elsewhere¹ is that the origin of evil is not in the revolt to which these stories are heightened, but in the discrepancy which even the severe writer of these stories feels. The stories are true in what may even be dramatic exaggeration, for the discrepancy can and does increase to a revolt. It may be said if the view of our author is correct, that if the strife of life is *all* due to ancestral iniquity, we are on a fair way to encourage revolt! He does not appear to look at things quite like that, but a sterner realism might do. We do not envisage revolt, however, in the first place. In a creature which, upon a thoroughgoing evolutionary theory, is advancing from outer to inner control, from mere reflex action to self-direction, we do not imagine a collapse from rigid 'right' to rigid 'wrong'. We seem to be dividing the truth at this point with a hatchet, where a lancet would be more appropriate. But there is the discrepancy, as we see it, when the control is switched over. We might imagine the Deity saying: 'I have wholly directed you hitherto, O Man, but now I desire that you should direct yourself.'

The crux is here, now. As we envisage this story, this is just where the whole providence of redemption comes in, not as an after-thought, with no postponement, not as a benevolent emergency measure, but as the fundamental fact in the providence of God. It is the very basis of the further human development. It is the context in which this making of self-directing humanity must proceed. And let us not overlook the fact that Old Testament literature eventually sees this — more by inspiration, than by reason, be it said.

Once more let us say that the standpoint of these stories is the theme of the Book of Job. That book, incidentally, is based as it would seem upon some more primitive folk-story about the man of Uz. We are not suggesting that these original stories are all contemporaneous, but they are of the same order. Thought did not get much further through many centuries on this theme. Moreover, the standpoint of the Book of Job seems to be very different from that of these probably more primitive stories. The unseen editor of the Book of Job seems to be very human, and his sympathies are with the poor victim, shall we say? Indeed, he was probably too near the kind of thing our quotation from Omar Khayyám suggests. But thought did not get very far on the theme. Our thinking, even in Christian Theology, is even now as we believe very inadequate. We have dichotomized too completely in this doctrine of the Fall. As indeed the Eden and the Babel stories do, we have succeeded in getting God too completely out of human life at the outset, and we cannot for the life of us get Him back again. At least, we are all under the challenge that our schemes to this end are too elaborate, too artificial, and not too convincing. Creation and Redemption, with this particularly strict hiatus between them, are so antithetical that we can only get redemption in ultimately as a *deus ex machina*. Even our conception of the Incarnation is of that order, and Jesus Christ is very reverently, but very inadequately, conceived after that fashion.

Our point is that if we commence with the whole ugly mass of evil in this

¹ Cf. *Revelation and the Unconscious*. (Epworth Press).

world, apart from this simultaneous fact of redemption, we are in confusion at once. We think we need to probe some mystery of evil and then find, or invent, a theory to account for it and annul it. This particularly analytical process has always been said to be unsatisfactory. We are thinking of Orientalism, and especially Gnosticism, which made this problem their starting-point. That process resulted in a great deal of fruitless speculation and invention, and a kind of magical or metaphysical soteriology. It was also productive of despair, and from that by reaction, we may suppose, of licentiousness. These philosophies lumped together, as we may say, physical and moral evil, individual and corporate sin, and began with the question 'Whence comes evil?' In our view it is equally relevant to ask 'Whence comes the good?'

When we were young preachers the counsel was often given us that we had to 'arouse a sense of sin' in people. That is beginning at the same point really. And if there is one peculiarity — or perversity — about humanity, it is this. Human beings have at one and the same time a sense of discrepancy and an incorrigible idealism. Incidentally, human beings have both these at the same time, or they have neither. There is no place for idealism unless there is a sense of discrepancy. There is no sense of discrepancy where there is no idealism. It is a case of conscience and consciousness side by side, for conscience seems to be the idealistic side of consciousness, to be born with it, so to speak. It is the moral side of it. Conscience may be said to reside within this sense of discrepancy — to span the gulf shall we say? A conscious person who has no sense of this discrepancy, not to say a sense of sin, would be a god or sub-sub-human. We have argued elsewhere¹ for some sense of values even in the animal creation. It is not only that 'a dog's obeyed in office'. It can assume a very arrogant mien in so doing. Domesticated, it can show a kind of remorse. It has an idea of discrepancy, within its own range of being, in more senses than one.

There may be many people who deny a literal Fall from perfection, upon some temporal occasion in the history of the race. Orthodoxy, in this and many other respects, commits what Professor A. N. Whitehead calls the 'Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness' (*Science & the Modern World*, p. 66 etc.). On the other hand there are very few sane people who deny the discrepant in their experience. It is not only that a man feels that he is below the standard of a hypothetical Deity. He is below his own. He never seems to catch quite up with himself, so to speak. We have our moments, of course, when we are, as the young folk say, 'on top of the world'. But we are a bit nervous of them, and they are probably rare. Designedly setting out, however, to 'arouse a sense of sin' (as the phrase goes) either by a doctrine of the Fall, or by any other means, we are apt only to arouse the idealism, by contrast. Indeed, we provoke that sense of idealism, as a — sometimes quite legitimate — defence mechanism. Here, again, we should prefer the reverse method. Unless we are very much mistaken, this was the method of Christ for the most part, at all events in His most intimate and personal approaches.

Our view, therefore, begins with a world non-moral — material, if you like — and as to any psychic element mere reflex. The conscious emerges from the erstwhile fixed mechanism in the animal, and later in the human aspect. It brings in the stress, the discrepancy between where we stand and whither we

¹ Op. cit.

have to climb. The emergent consciousness carries us from a sphere where we are neutral to a sphere where we cannot be neutral, must not be neutral. The race comes out of moral not-being into moral being, from the unconscious to the conscious. If the race goes wrong, it probably goes wrong at this point. If you can standardize that particular moment in human life as full salvation on one side of the line and full damnation on the other, we leave you to it. The discrepancy is here none the less. Out of it may come all the devilment of race that may be, but it is not there yet.

We are not beginning with the morally gross and allowing a progressive refinement as part of a mere evolutionary process. That is altogether too facile, and it really did confuse the nineteenth-century liberals. Even the question whether the world is any better to-day than yesterday is not much to the point. Moral excellence belongs to persons, not processes, and not *peoples* as such. Indeed, had the Creator designed to *make* a perfect world, with peoples thrown in (so to speak) he should certainly have kept to the mechanical, the reflex. Surely there was no point in individualization, or in individualizing any rational consciousness. Approximations might cancel out in a large mass if there were margins. The world could be in fairly good order because of what is 'compossible', to quote Leibnitz. Ragged ends might possibly cancel out on the law of averages, so to speak. But a real perfection goes by no such method. The kind of perfection we imagine the Creator to envisage is both physically and morally minute: 'as full, as perfect, in a hair as heart'. 'Not on the vulgar mass called "work" must sentence pass . . .' Moral personality is at stake. That cannot be made in the lump, and therefore it cannot be marred in the lump. God gave clay its personality, *its own*, and so says our oracle.

We do not therefore envisage a state of perfection, but of innocence — emergence from the non-moral into the moral. And there are two ways in which humanity can be inadequate in this respect. Man may refuse the quest,¹ the climb, the responsibility. Or, of course, he may run amok with it. Our unseen narrator in Genesis seems to expound a philosophy coming very near the former. In his own attitude, be it said, not in his story. He is much more naïve than we are. It is the very daring, the reckless progressiveness of this adventurous race which almost unnerves him. This toiling, cultivating, digging, hewing, building. These pains of child-birth for women. Toiling and sweating among the thorns and thistles, for the men. What is it all but a punishment for an initial rebellion, our reckless ambition? There are a great many people who still seem to think that work is a penalty for our remote ancestor's revolt rather than a privilege for his descendants. In both the Eden story and the one concerning Babel the conservatism is of this type. If only men had never emulated God, as artificer and cultivator. If only they had never dreamed of god-like status. In any event, if they had been content with more modest scope. Look at the risks. A booth in the garden and a limited range of fruits would have been sufficient. The rebels might never have needed clothes. Tents would have done rather than towers, hamlets rather than cities, wood rather than bronze, bronze rather than iron . . . and as for these many inventions . . . where is it all to stop? This is how the sin of the world originated, and how its dreary mass is accumulated.

¹ This is to take refuge in the unconscious.

And the trouble is here after all. Refuse this wretched strife up to and beyond the clouds of farther life, spurn these new tastes and these perspiring zests! That is one extreme — especially if there be no glimmering of a context of redemption in which this awful strife is set. The other extreme to this refusal is revolt, such as this story describes — in either case implicit or explicit distrust and selfishness. Alienation from God and true life as God endows it is the result. The fact is that we resent this experiment in moral personality. That perhaps is original sin, but God is more merciful about it than the theologians. The poor fellow in the New Testament put his talent in a hole.¹ There was his initial endowment. They could have it who owned it originally, but he did not throw it away! He was for taking no risks, and he did not like business. Moreover, he did not trust the management. The answer is that Man was designed to do things — risky things — and to become holy, not be merely safe. The poor, vulgar profits of life or virtue can hardly reconcile us to the process. We talk about the eagerness of childhood, and interpreting their actions as purely voluntary, when it pleases us, we can beat them or caress accordingly. Shakespeare seemed to think that the schoolboy goes to school with 'shining morning face' — but with no cheerful anticipations! Neither the child nor the primitive is so eager to make any progressive development. Much of modern life is almost pure reflex. Few care for anything different. Middle age soon sinks back into an equilibrium which is little less than premature senility. We have our private Nirvanas. We do not care for this experiment in moral personality. The writer of this paper has vivid memories of how he could have surrendered his Hebrew grammar to the leisurely dustman, and could have taken his placid place at the horse's head, in desperate moments. The sacred languages were both needed then, for divinity. Since then we may have encouraged a retreat to the unconscious in that matter!

An illustration would perhaps convey our view better than any further argument. There is no better way of envisaging this process and discipline of life than under the authentic figure of a child learning to walk. It is said that in *David Copperfield* Charles Dickens actually recalled his own efforts. He has certainly given us an amazing bit of child-psychology. He remembered his mother with her white hair and youthful shape, and Peggoty, with no shape at all, and eyes that seemed so dark as to darken 'the whole region of her face', and cheeks and arms so red he wondered the birds did not peck them for apples. He could remember these two, as he puts it, 'a little distance apart, dwarfed to my sight by stooping down or kneeling on the floor, and I (went) unsteadily from one to the other . . . I have an impression on my mind . . . of the touch of Peggoty's forefinger as she used to hold it out to me . . . roughened by needlework'. It appeared an appalling distance between the two limits of the journey. There were the mountainous inequalities of the floor beneath his feet, the huge and perplexing diagrams of carpet, the terrific apparition of stool, chair or table. How the world swam about him as he fell — into somebody's arms — and laughed a tearful laugh or two.

That is the moral journey we have to take. That is the measured task of life which we have to do by our own effort, within a safe and succouring Providence. The touch of Peggoty's forefinger, 'roughened by needlework',

¹ This is a clear case of taking refuge in the unconscious!

meant really, in the little lad's journey, that underneath were the everlasting arms. But there are children who will not venture, poor 'backward' infants who *will* crawl: will not forsake the old estate from which they should emerge. There are also some who will lie down and kick, and scream. And some will go off at a reckless tangent, off the line and into the fire, if you are not quick. The case for the fall is in this figure, but not as a temporal incident in history, and not necessarily from the completely erect posture or the original, precise and rhythmical stride in proud and complete control. Humanity, more fundamentally, is the 'backward' child. We do not all lie down and kick, or run amok. And, by the way, walking is a kind of mental and physical ambivalence — falling forward and catching yourself before it is too late. Theology has standardized it all too specifically. It catches us on the wrong leg, so to speak. This is its peculiar foible. It has blackened its shadows. It has made them too substantial. What we have to avoid is exaggeration, whether it arises from dramatization or incipient pessimism. Above all, do not let us exaggerate the remoteness of Man from God in order to indulge some rather complicated devices to unite them again. There is more of Milton in our Theology than even Moses. And Milton managed to make such a success of *Paradise Lost* that his *Paradise Regained* did not quite come off. Which thing is an allegory.

R. SCOTT FRAYN

THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME OF UNION

Two Questions

THERE can be no question about the deep and general desire for the reunion of the Churches. Anyone who is indifferent to this, must find it difficult to reconcile such indifference with the word of God, and the clearly-expressed will of Christ. The conception of the Church as the Building of Christ, His Body, and His Bride, does not lend itself to easily-tolerated division.

We are often reminded, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and other leaders of the Church, that however earnestly we may long for the healing of division, we must be patient, and meanwhile seek to understand those from whom we differ. At the same time we are reminded that in our eagerness to reunite, we must not, in any movement we may make, surrender vital principles, or treat lightly a difference which may be far-reaching and fundamental.

From time to time there are discussions, more or less sporadic, on the 'Proposed Scheme of Union of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, the South India United Church, and the South India Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church'. No one can contemplate this movement towards union without gratitude to God for the Christian spirit of the leaders as well as the courage and statesmanship with which they have laid the foundations. We are warranted in the hope that here we may reap the first fruits of a world-wide harvest.

At the moment, no steps are being taken which involve definite and final committal to the scheme, or its rejection. This may therefore be a fitting opportunity to examine one or two of its features upon which it is desirable further

light should be thrown. It is because I am not wholly satisfied with what is proposed, that I venture to set down my misgivings, and perhaps to evoke the guidance of those who are convinced there is nothing to fear.

It must be admitted that we, as Methodists, are at some disadvantage because of the busy life of Methodist ministers as a whole. Ours is largely a ministry of overworked pastors, and few have the leisure to pursue and probe the recondite phases of a scheme, which involves doctrinal research and exposition. We have, of course, men of learning and scholarship, but these, like their brethren, have inexorable tasks which consume most of their time and energy. They must, I should suppose, often look with envy at their Anglican brethren, who are favoured with time, resources, and undisturbed study. That is not to say that we are without powerful and influential leaders. The recognition accorded to Dr. R. Newton Flew, in the Faith and Order Movement, is sufficient proof of this.

There are, however, two features of the scheme, which seem to me to demand a fuller interpretation. And, following the advice of Dr. Temple, one should not hesitate to state one's doubts or fears. If these are without foundation, they will easily be dissipated, and only those which have substance in them will survive discussion. In a candid approach to an examination of any point which does not satisfy us, we have the example of Anglican leaders, in stating frankly, even bluntly, whatever seems to give reason for pause. It is not necessary to quote some of the hard sayings of the late Dr. Gore, Dr. Sparrow Simpson and Dr. Darwell Stone. These men have not allowed the promise of reunion to prevent them from saying what they know to be unpalatable.

The first point then, upon which it seems necessary to say a few words, is the conception of the Church, and especially the terms of membership. If we turn to the scheme itself, we find it affirmed that: 'the privileges and obligations of membership of the Church of South India belong to every person, who being resident in the area of that Church has been baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' Baptism is thus declared to be the means of entry into the Church. It is true that later in the same chapter, we are told that: 'it is the duty and privilege of every member of the Church to realize his sonship in the family of God, and to rejoice in his salvation through Jesus Christ, in whom we have forgiveness of sins: and further to work out that salvation by being diligent in private and family prayers, etc.' Most readers, will I think agree that there is a vagueness in the phrase: 'to realize his sonship'. Apparently what is meant is that by prayer, the study of the Scriptures, 'attendance at public worship and Holy Communion', the person who has been baptized justifies or fulfils the hope and prayer of those who administered the Sacrament of Baptism, when that person was a babe. But it should be observed that this realization of sonship is not the entrance into Church membership, it is only its development and fulfilment. The babe becomes a member of the Church through baptism. It may be that there are Methodists who are unable to attach any other significance to baptism, and who regard their children, when baptized as members of the Church. What we have to consider, however, is whether this is the teaching of our Church, and if it can be reconciled with our history or our doctrine. It seems plain from Article XIX of the Anglican Church that the idea of all who are baptized being

members of the Church, did not satisfy those responsible for the definition. They said 'the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same'. The words 'a congregation of faithful men' throw the emphasis upon character and conduct, and it is neither expressed nor assumed that baptism has constituted membership of the Church.

If we turn to our own doctrinal standards, we shall look in vain for the teaching that every baptized infant becomes thereby a member of the Church and that all that is afterwards needed is a reasonable conformity with Christian practice and belief. John Wesley in his sermon entitled 'Of the Church' expounds Paul's words in Ephesians iv. 16, and then adds: 'Here then is a clear unexceptionable answer to that question "What is the Church?" The catholic or universal Church is all the persons in the universe whom God hath so called out of the world, as to entitle them to the preceding character, as to be "one body" united by "one spirit" having one faith, one hope, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all.' But far more relevant and convincing than any single passage is the whole body of Wesley's gospel. His ministry was a strong, clear call to the unconverted. He did not ask the crowds that gathered about him if they had been baptized. He asked them if they knew that their sins were forgiven, whether or no they had passed from death into life. In his Sermon on 'The New Birth' he says categorically that 'baptism is not the new birth' and is 'distinct from regeneration'. It is impossible, therefore, to reconcile his teaching with the doctrine that a new birth is not a necessity, and that what is required is baptism and thereafter a conformity with prescribed rules, and moral respectability. If then there is any word of Scripture which enshrines with greater fullness and emphasis the master truth of all Wesley's preaching it is 'Ye must be born again'. And it is a question to be asked in passing, if our subdued tones, when this truth comes into view, is not largely responsible for our ineffective preaching to-day.

It would be easy to quote other Methodist theologians, but one further passage may suffice: It is always a source of wonder to me that Dr. G. G. Findlay's little volume entitled *The Church of Christ as Set Forth in the New Testament* has been allowed to go out of print. In this devout and scholarly exposition, he defines the Church as 'the holy community of Christ's people, called out of the world by the gospel message, and united in work and worship as citizens of the heavenly kingdom'. The only comment necessary in the atmosphere of such a passage is, that the idea of the Church, for him as for Wesley was a company of men and women, to whom had come a divine call, to which they had penitently responded, receiving thereby the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, and a place in the community of kindred souls. Without pressing this point unduly, it is, I suggest reasonable and indeed imperative, that Methodists who discuss the Scheme of Union, with their brethren, should require that the value and necessity of the new birth is clearly recognized and expressed. If the Church of Christ consists only of the 'once-born', not only is all true evangelism cut at the roots but the distinctive message and *raison d'être* of Methodism is overlaid, one had almost said betrayed. What one misses in

the Scheme is any recognition of the miracle of conversion. 'Those are members', it is said, 'who have been baptized, and receiving the grace of God with faith continue steadfast therein.' But what of those who are baptized, and do not continue steadfast? Can one look out again upon the world to-day without sorrowfully recognizing that the overwhelming majority of those who have been baptized, do not attempt or profess to continue steadfast? What hope is there for them? Have we a gospel which meets their need? It would be a simple mockery to exhort them to continue in what has not been begun, or have long ago surrendered. The only hope for the prodigal is a new beginning. It was this new beginning which was the heart and essence of the preaching of early Methodism. And if we would lay bare the secret of the power and progress of Methodism, we must look not only at what Wesley said and did, but at the life and labours of the powerful men who, without any High Church entanglements and proclivities, were his colleagues and carried on the work when he had been called to rest. With this so clearly in view, it does appear to me that the importance and necessity of an evangelism which proclaims the new birth, should find clear and definite expression. That surely is the message we were raised up to deliver, and not even reunion should cause us to put it into a kind of cold storage. If there is one axiom more generally recognized than another in all our discussions on reunion it is that 'the desirable things' of all the Churches should be brought into the common treasury; and if Methodism has a distinctive offering, it is the evangelism which affirms that men can and need to be born again. I do not find any such doctrine expressed or implied in the various statements embodied in the Scheme. In my judgment there should be a serious and resolute endeavour to enshrine this doctrine in terms which cannot be overlooked. We dare not acquiesce in a conception of the Church whose membership is restricted to those who were baptized as infants and continue to live a 'godly righteous and sober life'. If we do what becomes of Charles Wesley's greatest hymns? There can be no place in such a Church for such soul-stirring lines, as

Long my imprisoned spirit lay
Fast bound in sin and nature's might;
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray;
I woke, the dungeon flamed with light,
My chains fell off, my heart was free,
I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

The teaching which omits all reference, except in vague and unconvincing terms, to a new birth, is alien to the whole teaching of Methodist theology. Take as one illustration, when hundreds are available, the words Dr. J. S. Banks. One of the greatest chapters in his closely-packed *Manual of Christian Doctrine* deals with 'The Experience of Salvation'. From his exposition of such terms as Justification, Regeneration and Sanctification, he passes to the subject of the Church, and begins with these words: 'The whole body of the saved, whose experience has been just described, constitutes the Church.' Fidelity therefore to the truth we teach, demands that we do not regard it as sufficient to say that membership of the Church is initiated by baptism, and maintained

by irreproachable conduct. Because of this it seems to me that it is for those Methodists who assist in drafting the contents of the Scheme in its final form to incorporate a truth, which is as distinct as it is fundamental.

There is, however, another subject which is equally important, and which has given rise to even greater concern; it is the doctrine of the Christian ministry. The approach to this subject may be appropriately made by stating in outline the beliefs and practice of Methodism. Let us envisage a typical instance. Here is a young man, who is an avowed Christian, and a member of our Church. In all probability he is a local preacher. He soon shows himself to have gifts and graces which direct the thought of his Church and Circuit to the Ministry as his vocation. He himself also has the conviction that it is in this direction the Spirit of God is leading him. The steps which have to be taken in relation to our Church courts, are too well known to require detailed statement here. The candidate submits to rigorous tests and a prolonged training. He must make proof of his fitness by a probation which, with College training, covers seven years, at the end of that time after a searching examination he is approved by his brethren, and recommended for ordination. The ordination culminates in a solemn service which includes the laying on of hands. It is not for a moment held that special grace or prerogative is mediated through human hands or instrumentality. The ordinand is 'set apart' in prayer and consecration for the work of the ministry. He does not acquire in ordination any power or authority, which exalts him above the godly men and women of the Churches, among whom it is his privilege to labour. As a matter of fitness and order he is authorized to administer the Sacraments, but what he does a devout layman can do also. His authority is spiritual, and his influence grows from the exclusive devotion with which he ministers to the flock of Christ, and warns sinners to flee from the wrath to come. It is expected of him, that being released from earning a livelihood in business, he shall be an example in his ceaseless regard for the Church and in the presentation of the truth as it is in Jesus. Only in so far as he is a spirit-filled, and a spirit-led man, can he be a good minister of Jesus Christ. He is held in honour by the Churches, whose servant he rejoices to be. He speaks little of claims and rights as a minister, for he knows that the only influence and authority which count in the Church must repose in him, not because he is invested with an authority episcopally mediated, but because he is utterly devoted to the well-being of his people, and the advance of the Kingdom.

When we turn to the Scheme we are now considering we become aware of a conception of the ministry which differs from the one we have outlined, in certain vital particulars. The relevant paragraph in what is spoken of as 'The Basis of Union' describes in general terms, the Ministry of the Church, to which little or no objection can be offered. And indeed throughout there is a manifest anxiety not to give offence to any of the Churches proposing to unite. This Christian spirit, and magnanimity must be recognized. There is no suggestion of pride or postulated superiority. Where then, or how, does there arise any question or hesitation? The answer is best reached by keeping in mind what it is the Anglican Church desires, and indeed is resolved to maintain. The largest and most influential part of that Church is as firmly resolved to unite with the Eastern Church, as with the Free Churches. It is little wonder

that it regards itself as a 'bridge' Church; but any bridge which links the Free Churches of this country with the Eastern Churches must span a very wide chasm. This appears if we set over against the Free Church ministry, as I have described it, the idea of the ministry as it exists in the Eastern Church. This Church attaches equal importance to Holy Scripture, and Holy Tradition. Apparently it still teaches that Adam and Eve are literally the first parents of the human race! The Church is defined as 'composed of men having one and the same faith, partaking of the same sacraments, and is divided into the laity and the clergy', the function of the latter is 'to rule, and who trace their descent by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, and through them from our Lord Jesus Christ' (Michael Constantinides). This doctrine of Apostolic succession is held however, not only by the Eastern Church, but with various interpretations, by many leading clergy of the Anglican Church as well. Eminent Anglicans have gone so far as to declare that without the full and unequivocal recognition of apostolic succession they could not remain in the Church, and that any other ministry is invalid. Thus, when reunion came to be discussed in South India, the beliefs both of the Eastern Church and a powerful section of the Anglican Church had to be recognized. The problem then was, how to incorporate in a united Church a ministry which does not accept, and therefore lays no claim to being in the apostolic succession, with one which not only did make such a claim, but held at the same time that, without the distinctive grace implied, any ministry however blessed of God must still be imperfect. It requires no great powers of discernment to perceive how acute was the difficulty. How then is it proposed to solve the problem? There could of course be no single step forward if any ministry was bluntly declared to be invalid. It seems also as if progress would be equally impossible if apostolic succession were denied. It is provided therefore in this Scheme that all ministries shall be recognized, but those not episcopally ordained, must submit to limitations. They may find that a Church refuses to allow them the privilege of administering the Sacrament of Holy Communion, because of a supposed defect in their orders. It may very well be that such a veto would seldom be effected, nor would a minister greatly mind if it were. But it is prescribed that from the date of union all who are ordained, must receive their ordination at the hands of the bishop. Thus gradually the whole ministry will be episcopally ordained and at the end of thirty years, it is assumed there will be few survivors among the ministers with only the grace of such an ordination as our own. It is difficult to see then how any minister can have a sense of perfect equality, whose orders are implied to be inadequate, defective, and inferior in value to those of the brother ministers among whom he works.

But the question goes deeper than that. If it were only a matter of status or supposed superiority, no one with a vision of the reunited Church would make a stumbling-block of a matter so small. The question really is: Is the United Church to hold and teach the doctrine of Apostolic succession, as it is held and taught by the Eastern Church, by Rome, and by a section of the Anglican Church. I cannot but believe that at least a tacit endorsement of this doctrine is involved in the Scheme. We have therefore to make up our minds upon this subject. It is not to the point to say that the Anglican Church has not, as a Church, made up *its* mind. Dean Inge

may reject the doctrine with contempt. Others may whittle down its significance and suggest that nothing of serious import is involved. Such an assumption, however, cannot lightly be made. How is it that the priest exercises a power over his people, which goes far to rob them of robust independence, and at the same time relieves them of personal responsibility? It is because, as a priest, he is in the possession of power or grace which invests him with a claim to invoke the wrath of God, and implement the miseries of Purgatory. Without the theory of apostolic succession, the power of the priest would wither, but with it he is an intermediary between man and God, irrespective of his own personal life. 'The Priests' unworthiness and moral deficiency' says Constantinides 'do not constitute an obstacle to the conveyance of divine grace to the recipient.' It is vain we urge that the theory of Apostolic succession only came into existence late in the second century, and cannot be supported by a single word of our Lord or of His Apostles. It is inextricably woven into the texture of the Eastern Church, and as we have seen is tenaciously held by many Anglicans. Now the question which must be faced is, whether this theory is adroitly secured in the Scheme, and if so, whether as Protestants we can assent to its inclusion, and still remain faithful to the principles of the Reformation. And it is because of the doubt in my own mind that I have ventured to raise the question. We may be called upon to face the dilemma of choosing whether to be faithful to the heritage of truth as we have received it, or to acquiesce in a Scheme which may need to be considered afresh, in the hope that reunion, when it comes, will not be found to have reached its consummation by the sacrifice of vital principles.

RICHARD PYKE

SHAKESPEARE'S LAST PHASE

IT was Carlyle who said of Shakespeare that his works are so many windows through which we see a glimpse of the world that was in him. The difficulty is that it was not one world but many, in fact a whole universe full of incredible variety and vitality — 'myriad-minded', Coleridge called him — and it is therefore not easy to reconstruct the poet's elusive personality.

The range of his work indicates his wide versatility. His genius extended over many fields. He left no part of contemporary life untouched. He portrayed the Court and the beggar. He knew the Stage and the Law. He could squander his genius in tiresome comedy and tedious puns and he could use it in the creation of a Hamlet and a Lear. He was equally at home in city streets, in country lanes, in the hot *piazas* of Venice and Milan — where, so far as we know, he had never been — and on the stormy face of the sea. Nothing seemed to come amiss to him. And through it all ran a deep, underlying current of philosophy, so deep that we can hardly think it was unconscious, that Shakespeare was unaware of, or indifferent to, the profound issues which he raised. It was, says Professor Dover Wilson, the projection into the moral sphere of an overmastering dramatic impulse.¹

Before we come to the problem of his last phase we ought to glance briefly at

¹ *The Essential Shakespeare* (1935 ed.), p. 123.

what preceded it. Three hundred and fifty years have passed since a country boy from Stratford set out for London to seek his fortune: a young married man, twenty-one years old, already the father of three children, including the doubtful blessing of twins. Why did he go? How did he travel? What exactly was he leaving? And to what immediate objective, if any, was he travelling? We do not know. It is all part of the Shakespeare enigma. We only know he came of no great family, possessed no money, no title, and apparently few prospects, yet within seven years he had made for himself a considerable reputation in London, and twenty-seven years later we find him back in Stratford, a man of property, owner of the finest house in the town, part proprietor of several London theatres, author of nearly forty popular plays, taking an active part in local affairs, dying in 1616 at the comparatively early age of fifty-two.

It is true his path had not been entirely one of roses. The University Wits, that is Marlowe and his brilliant group — the professional playwrights and members of the ancient universities — had been greatly annoyed by the novelty of actors like Shakespeare and Ben Jonson actually writing their own plays. What indeed was the world coming to! Actors should act and not create. It was not for them to ape their betters and try to produce, clumsily, fine literature. So annoyed were they that one of their number, Robert Greene, embittered by age as well as jealousy, denounced Shakespeare as 'an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers' with 'his tiger's heart wrapt in a player's hide', and giped at him as bombastic and conceited;¹ but within a few weeks of the attack Greene was dead and the young 'upstart' was embarking on the full tide of his success.

Why did he retire so early? This brings us to the consideration of the third and final stage of his career. But, first, what brought him back to Stratford at the early age of forty-seven? There are many theories, fanciful and otherwise. Was it illness, decline of power, family trouble, nostalgia? Was he tired of the city, the sawdust and pretence of the theatre, and longing for his native meadows and sheepfolds? Or was it that he had made his fortune and wished to retire? We know he had made money. For twenty years he had been acquiring property in Stratford as well as purchasing a financial interest in London playhouses — The Globe and Blackfriars. He had been actor, author, manager and part proprietor. Also in those days men aged earlier and life was shorter. We assume therefore that Shakespeare's return to Stratford was the early and natural retirement of a successful man. We know, from documents, he had a keen business mind.

But that is not the whole of the problem. His work as well as his personal life shows at this period a distinct and curious change. That in itself is not surprising, for age brings maturity and mellowness. There had been already, round about the year 1601, an earlier and equally marked change, in Shakespeare's transition from comedy — especially of the slapstick order — by way of romantic comedy and historical pageants to pure tragedy. *Julius Caesar*, we are told, 'is the gateway to the tragic period'. It was followed in an incredibly short time by Shakespeare's sole morbid and cynical work, *Measure for Measure*, and then come at a gallop: *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus* and *Timon of Athens*. The swiftness with which they come and their large-scale conception make us breathless. They are tossed off apparently with such

¹ *A Groat'sworth of Wit.*

consummate ease and Shakespeare at the time was at the height of his power.

Take Lear, for example. Lamb declared that he is too great for adequate stage representation. He argued — and with a good deal of reason — that you cannot act Lear. If you attempt to, you only present a feeble old man tottering about the stage with a walking stick, after having been turned out of doors by his daughters on a rainy night. And Lamb, up to a point, is right. Lear is far more than a doddering old imbecile or even a frail old gentleman. Lear — the real Lear — is Titanic, Promethean, of the world of Thor and Job and Achilles. He is momentous, legendary, a timeless figure rising not from a human stage but from the mists of antiquity, stimulating within us impulses and emotions we hardly knew were there, and presenting us in his martyrdom with a cross-section of eternity. And no stage properties are equal to such a profound conception. 'The greatness of Lear', it has been said, 'is not in corporal dimension but in intellectual.'¹

The same is true of other of his tragic heroes. Othello as recently presented at Stratford was a pleasant and agreeable figure but not in the least the Othello of Shakespeare; which raises the interesting controversial point — and we can raise it without being in the least unappreciative: how far is Stratford interpreting the real Shakespeare? The overpowering fury, the demonic jealousy, as well as the natural dignity and greatness of Othello, were missing. On the other hand, as De Quincey points out, Shakespeare's main characters are inexhaustible, that is unfathomable, such as Prospero and Caliban, and therefore no one interpretation is complete. Also, it can be fairly argued, that Shakespeare wrote not for posterity but for immediate stage needs and presumably from the box-office standpoint, in which case such characters and scenes were obviously meant to be acted. But let us remember they were presented on a simple stage under the open sky with far more natural effects, under conditions very different from stage conditions to-day, and to audiences whose taste had not been vitiated by Hollywood. Such a stage and such conditions were more appropriate to their presentation than those provided by modern theatrical ingenuity and complexity.

And, further, these central tragic figures, to be rightly understood, must be conceived as incarnations of intense passion and suffering or, in the case of the criminal ones, of evil. Mere stage interpretation is not enough. They require ethical as well as dramatic exposition. Here A. C. Bradley has set a great tradition. They have to be placed besides such works as Milton's *Satan*, Goethe's *Faust* and the Hebrew *Job*. They have to be elucidated psychologically and philosophically. In fact, we might say that they are more closely related to theology — not dogmatic theology but theology in a broad sense — than we think. Shakespeare rarely observed the dramatic unities, that is the unities of time, place and plot, but he was invariably true to the Aristotelian rule regarding the *cathartic* or *purgative* or, as someone has very well said, the *homeopathic* nature of great tragedy in literature, meaning of course the cleansing or refining element in suffering. Man is presented as wrestling with his destiny, the powers of good and evil are shown in marked contrast against a background of waste and calamity, and through it and out of it character emerges and grows. That is, broadly, the effect of watching or reading Shakespearean tragedy. Although

¹ Lamb.

² D. R. Hardman, *What about Shakespeare* (1938), p. 155.

the stage at the end is littered with dead bodies the result is not depressing, as we should suppose, but clarifying and even exhilarating. The emotions are refined through pity and fear. As Mr. D. R. Hardman points out in Browning's words: 'We rise baffled, to fight better.' It indicates the victory of the Spirit, the vindication of the moral order.

Following that tragic and rich period came the final change. Shakespeare in his last four plays appears to swing right back to the happier features — that is, the pastoral and romantic scenes — of his earliest period. And yet, actually, did he? True, he forsook the realm of pure tragedy. He did not give us another Lear or Richard III. Macbeth and the introspective Hamlet were never repeated. But there are features in these final plays which call for close attention and which show that these plays are not entirely what they are generally supposed to be. The plays concerned are *Pericles*, with its pathetic story of the lost Marina; *Cymbeline*, a tale of ancient Britain, containing that exquisite lyric with its clear echo of farewell — the requiem for the foolish Cloten:

Fear no more the heat o' the sun,
Nor the furious winter's rages;
Thou thy worldly task hast done,
Home art gone and ta'en thy wages,

and ending:

Quiet consummation have;
And renowned be thy grave!

The third play is *The Winter's Tale* with its picture of Perdita, also lost, and of shepherds and country clowns and the rebirth of spring; the plot a mild replica of *Othello*. And, lastly, *The Tempest* where in a final burst of genius Shakespeare, many think, transcended all he had ever written and gathered up, allegorically, into a single and miraculous unity, in the shape of an enchanted island and a cleansed and brave new world, all his incomparable skill and vision. Rarely, if ever, has human genius soared so high, although a play like *King Lear* contains far more power and emotion. But they belong to different worlds, each great of its kind. Mr. Middleton Murry believes *The Tempest* to be the most perfect prophetic achievement of the Western mind and speaks of its magical clearness. It is like a silver flute. 'It stands on the very verge of a condition that still lies far before the human soul.'¹ Professor Dover Wilson, with equal enthusiasm, compares it with the drama of Job, the cosmic novels of Dostoevsky, Beethoven's last phase, and the story of the marriage at Cana of Galilee.² It is a return to nature, beauty and the simple happiness of life.

But we must be careful not to allow our enthusiasm to run away with us. It would be nice to think that Shakespeare ended on a high note of reconciliation, that he came home like a prodigal and lived happily ever after. And, indeed, it is easy to pick out the endless references to springtime and forgiveness in these last plays. Until recently the general view was that they were the mellow work of an old and practised hand and of one whose lines had finally fallen in pleasant places. The ship was nearing harbour; the adventurer had returned; the storms and hazards were over. Now the poet with his children round him, his main

¹ *The Necessity of Art*, ed. by P. Dearmer (1924), p. 160. ² *The Essential Shakespeare*, p. 134.

work done, secure in domesticity and the affection of his friends, was settled as a solid and respected burgher, perhaps even a pious churchwarden, stretching his legs by the fire, with only the distant echo of the theatre in his ears. He had reached his enchanted island, his land of desire. The brave new world was at hand. After all the striving, the suffering, the discord — and God knows how much there may have been behind his incredible genius! — we see him, so we are told, sailing superbly into the blue lagoon of repose and content. Gaiety, tragedy, serenity — so the Shakespeare cycle ran; first, the heat and amorousness of youth, then the struggle of middle age — the dark night of the soul, culminating in final and unruffled calm.

But is it true? Life does not usually work out like that, and certainly his own mature drama did not. There are, moreover, objections which cannot lightly be dismissed. They may be grouped roughly under three heads.

First of all, there is in these final plays a sense of storm and disturbance as well as of serenity. Look, for instance, at the shipwrecks they contain. Prospero calls it 'sea-sorrow'. It would almost seem as if Shakespeare at this period were obsessed with the thought of catastrophe and tempest. In *Pericles* we have three separate shipwrecks. The second act contains a scene of wind and rain on an open shore almost as wild as that in *King Lear*. The third act shows the birth and rescue of Marina in a storm at sea — one of the most harrowing things Shakespeare ever wrote. And Marina, the child of the storm, dominates the play:

When I was born, the wind was north,

and again, those haunting lines:

Born in a tempest, when my mother died,
This world to me is like a lasting storm . . .

The Winter's Tale is pitched in the same key. Its very name suggests the end of things — gloom, weariness, depression. There is a shipwreck in the third act. Once more a child is involved, this time Perdita — the lost or abandoned one, born in a prison. And, again, in *The Tempest* the title indicates storm. It opens like *Macbeth* with thunder and lightning to which are added a sinking ship and the cries of drowning men.

Secondly, there is savagery and bestiality in these plays as well as gentleness and beauty. In fact no plays of Shakespeare contain passages of greater hate or unpleasantness. Antiochus's daughter, it is true, 'comes apparell'd like the spring', but Caliban comes like the devil. Shakespeare's other villains are often refined and subtle, but Caliban is the incarnation of inhumanity, completely uncivilized, part man, part brute, part devil. There is in *Cymbeline* Posthumus's savage outcry against women. There is the brothel scene in *Pericles* — a reflection of Shakespeare's sardonic mood in *Measure for Measure*. There is the subject of incest which occupies the first scene. And Dionyza's speech in the same play where she tempts her servant, Leonine, to murder Marina is an echo of Lady Macbeth:

Let not conscience . . .
Inflame too nicely. Nor let pity which
Even women have cast off, melt thee, but be
A soldier to thy purpose.

In fact there are many such echoes of Shakespeare's earlier work; not only a revival of pastoral and fantasy but at the same time a return to his darker themes. Perhaps the two are cunningly and deliberately interwoven. This at any rate is true, that the volcano was by no means extinct. The old fires of jealousy and passion still smouldered, even by the quiet Avon side. These final plays reflect treachery, desertion, betrayal, misfortune, in fact all the constituents of potential tragedy as well as quieter and gentler themes.

Thirdly, there is in this period an oppressive sense of age linked on to a good deal of sombre comment touching such themes as fate, time and death. It is possible to group together a surprising number of passages where Shakespeare appears to be saying farewell. And he is saying it mainly though not entirely in a mood of melancholy. Many find here a final message of unclouded hope and immortality. I confess I am not so sure. There is in Shakespeare a dual strain. We find it in his plays. It runs through his characters as, for example, Hamlet and Macbeth. And it emerges in his philosophy. At times he indicates his unwavering belief in Providence and reveals a strong faith and robust optimism, but at other times he appears wistful and uncertain.

Nowhere is this more clear than in Prospero's farewell speech beginning: 'Our revels now are ended,' with its clear reference to actors and spirits and the impermanence of life — 'We are such stuff as dreams are made on.' It occurs in the reapers' scene, in the middle of a masque, a scene of great beauty and delight; but how many recall how those famous lines end?

Sir, I am vex'd:

Bear with my weakness; my old brain is troubled.

Be not disturb'd with my infirmity.

If you be pleas'd, retire into my cell

And there repose: a turn or two I'll walk,

To still my beating mind.

Shades of Lear and Hamlet! The whole of that part of the scene has been dramatically introduced by Prospero 'starting suddenly', by a confused noise, by the nymphs and reapers disappearing and the visions vanishing; and Prospero says aside in hollow tones:

I had forgot that foul conspiracy

Of the beast Caliban,

and again:

We must prepare to meet with Caliban.

Dr. A. C. Bradley traces here the whole mind of Shakespeare in his last years¹ — mysticism and pessimism poetically interwoven. 'Joy and woe are woven fine.' Shakespeare even in his happiest play could not long forget what he calls elsewhere 'the foul body of th' infected world' — 'that foul conspiracy' — a brooding sense of the apparent incurability of evil, and the approaching shades of night.

It is crystallized in the title of his last play but one, *The Winter's Tale*. The boy, Mamillius, seated by the fire on a winter's night begins a story to his mother — a sad tale because 'a sad tale's best for winter' and it opens by

¹ *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1924 ed.), pp. 328-330.

a churchyard. Again, at the end of the play, Paulina is surely speaking for Shakespeare himself:

I, an old turtle,
Will wing me to some wither'd bough, and there
My mate, that's never to be found again,
Lament till I am lost.

And again in the words of Camillo: 'It is fifteen years since I saw my country; though I have for the most part been aired abroad, I desire to lay my bones there.' And in a speech of Polixenes:

My affairs
Do even drag me homeward; which to hinder
Were in your love a whip to me.

There are numerous similar examples. There is the youthful Arviragus in *Cymbeline*, addressing the ancient Belarius in their mountain cave:

What should we speak of
When we are old as you? When we shall hear
The rain and wind beat dark December . . .

And Belarius's fine reply:

O boys! this story
The world may read in me; my body's mark'd
With Roman swords, and my report was once
First with the best of note.

Dare we go on and discover further reminiscence in that same speech?

Then was I as a tree
Whose boughs did bend with fruit, but, in one night,
A storm or robbery, call it what you will,
Shook down my mellow hangings, nay, my leaves,
And left me bare to weather.

This raises the problem of the autobiographical element in Shakespeare which lies outside our present study but obviously there is rich material, though we must be careful not to read into it things not intended, but the references are too numerous and the analogies too close to be overlooked. One of the finest examples is in *Pericles* — a play in which we are told plainly: 'Now our sands are almost run,' and are also asked to hear an old man sing, and have the comic tale of the three fishers concerning human infirmities, with Time 'the king of men' — where, in the opening scene, Pericles in saying good-bye uses the image of a legacy, bequeathing first 'a happy peace' to Antiochus and all good men, and then, to the daughter of Antiochus:

My riches to the earth from whence they came,
But my unspotted fire of love to you.
Thus ready for the way of life or death,
I wait the sharpest blow.

But in spite of this personal strain of melancholy there is no final sense of frustration or futility. Shakespeare is no fatalist. Compare him for a moment

with Greek drama. Think of Aeschylus with his deep undertones of vengeance and retribution and the chill wind of bitterness and discord which blows through most of the plays of Euripides. Recall Alcestis passing to her doom — the cold pity, the veiled woman, the unreal symbolism, the ghostly resurrection; and Medea, the bride of hate, the blood-red mother — 'Tigress, not woman, beast of wilder breath.' True, she is inspired with superhuman force but at the end of that wild Greek tragedy nothing remains but the sound of her curses and 'death slow winging to the dark'. God is deaf and Jason's prayers are lost upon the wind. It is the same in *The Trojan Women*, which ends with the smoking walls of Troy, the vanity of achievement, life dancing 'like an idiot in the wind', and the bitter cry of the Trojan women as they pass into captivity:

'Wrath in the earth and quaking and a flood that sweepeth all.'

(In parenthesis, this last play is curiously up to date in atmosphere and sentiment, and relevant to immediate events.) True, Sophocles, the most pious of the poets of Greece, reveals more tenderness and charity, and makes us ask whether Shakespeare was, relatively, so very far ahead of Greek religious thought; but here in Shakespeare is warm human sympathy and usually, in the end, if not a happy ending at least a sense of recovery and re-integration. The weakness of Greek drama is its greyness, its cold doctrine of fate, of blind and inevitable necessity. But in Shakespeare is no final pessimism. The anguish is there, all the torture and burden of life, but intermingled with gaiety and laughter and ending in this final period in restoration and happiness.

A closer comparison perhaps would be with Goethe. After the tortuous windings of *Faust* — the cynicism, the despair, the grim disillusion, the utter bankruptcy of spirit — comes the final scene — the anchorites, the angels, the sweet voices of children, the chorus of the penitents, with roses showered from the sky, and everywhere light and music as Gretchen comes from Heaven to greet the soul of Faust. It is Goethe's Hallelujah Chorus:

Joy's everlasting fire,
Love's glow of pure desire.

And the prayer:

Come holy fire, within me dwelling . . .
My needy heart do thou illumine!

So with Shakespeare, although not so emotionally, in the closing words of *The Tempest*:

And my ending is despair
Unless I be relieved by prayer.

His last word, then, is not disillusion. Life after all is not an idiot's tale, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Even the Rabelaisian Falstaff can babble in death of green fields. Cleopatra had immortal longings. Norfolk on the field of battle gave his 'pure soul unto his captain Christ'. And in *The Tempest*, among the greatest of all great plays, where we have not merely the poet's final message but, gathered into a last miracle, the quintessence of all he ever thought or wrote, we are by the sea and in quiet meadows. The poet has come home at

last and perhaps in more senses than one. The world is full of music and enchantment. Reconciliation is in the air. The discord is resolved; the grey sisters have receded; the tempest is over. Even Caliban cries for mercy; and Hymen's hymn from *As You Like It* comes true:

Then is there mirth in heaven
When earthly things made even
Atone together.

Or as Cymbeline sums it up:

Pardon's the word to all.

At the same time we must not forget that *The Tempest* is concerned with fairy-land and to that extent unreal. Three of its main characters — Ariel, Prospero, Caliban — are non-human. It contains no mention of God. And the forgiveness achieved is at the instigation of Ariel, the poetic or imaginative spirit. True, it treats of a fourth dimension. It is a brilliant synthesis of two worlds and possesses a profound allegorical meaning; but it lacks the power, the body and substance, of a play like *King Lear*, where in Lear's broken and contrite heart we are much nearer the New Testament. We are justified therefore in not claiming too much for this final period, particularly from the religious aspect. Shakespeare is indivisible and no interpretation is complete apart from reference to his work as a whole.

FREDERICK C. GILL

IS GOD NEUTRAL?

MAYBE, in asking this question, we are rushing in where theologians fear to tread, but we must plead with those who are the leaders of our thought, and those who formulate our convictions, for guidance and more definiteness than we have yet received in this life and death struggle in which we are engaged. There are learned dissertations on this question, but seemingly, we cannot translate our thought into terms of helpfulness and assurance for the ordinary man. Perhaps we have thought so much that we have lost our way in the jungle of abstractions and inhibitions which gather about this question, or the real reason for our helplessness may lie in the fact that we have been intimidated by a materialistic science, browbeaten out of our convictions about the Divine Activity, bludgeoned by a godless interpretation of facts, and robbed of our spiritual insight by the excess of light which science and learning have brought to our generation.

During the war we have listened with astonishment to the emphatic pronouncements of some of our most trusted and capable military leaders who, perhaps because they are not entangled in theological abstractions, are free to formulate their convictions and declare their experiences unhindered by the logical contradictions of which they may be guilty. We are aware of the fact that every nation conscripts God for its own purpose in a life and death struggle. It has great propaganda value, and it is no small gain to capture and harness religious sentiments to a national purpose. But there are countless things in

life which we have not yet formulated in thought, there are convictions which we cannot adequately express, experiences which will not fit into any human thought-forms, and there are theologies which are totally inadequate to match the majesty of God and the wonder of His activity. There are things in life which we do not find in our books, and maybe, after all, the men who are most deeply involved in the present struggle have seen something, within it, as countless numbers have seen in all ages, which compels them to bow their heads in reverence, something which no argument or dissertation could express, something which enabled them to see the Unseen Hosts of God moving in silent array amidst the clash of arms and through the smoke of battle, as men a generation ago saw the Angels at Mons as they marched in their sleep.

There is something pathetic in the way men turn to us for guidance in their mental bewilderment as they struggle to resist something which they instinctively feel they ought to resist. They want to know if the Divine Activity is allied to their own moral sense, and if that activity is engaged, as desperately as they are, in resisting evil with all the resources and reserves of goodness available in the universe. And there is something tragic in the way they turn away from us 'With head bloody but unbowed' leaving us in our theological sanctuaries with our dumb oracles, our evasions and our hesitations. 'The hungry sheep look up and are not fed,' as Milton complained.

In the confusions of our time, and in the hieroglyphic character of the catastrophic events which crash into our life, we are all confused and baffled, but Christianity is matched to confusion and in chaos it finds its sphere. Religion is not in the first place an explanation or an interpretation of life but it ought to be able out of its experiences to supply explanation and interpretation. We have always professed to be interpreters of life, and claimed that we were the custodians of the oracles of God. Have the oracles passed from our keeping? Are there no prophets in Israel? Are we guardians of a silent sanctuary save as we strive to catch the faint whispers and echoes of a past in which God was recognized as doing something and saying something relevant to a former situation?

We are experts in the interpretation of the past. What happened to the Jebusites we have examined microscopically. We can talk confidently about the mighty acts of God in ancient Israel. We profess to interpret with a fair degree of accuracy the spiritual experiences of those who consulted the oracles in days of old, and with them we rejoice in the answers which they received. But the interest of the ordinary man is not met in giving ancient answers to modern questions, or answers which were relevant at one time in the past, neither is he satisfied with the mystification which our abundant learning has spun about some very pressing questions which cry aloud for answer. G. B. Shaw warned us against the man whose God was in the sky. We need to be warned against the man whose God is in the past.

The church seems to have lost the sense of God's presence in history because it has been for the most part absorbed in deciphering the mysteries of God's dealings with the individual soul, and in giving an interpretation of the transcendental relationship involved in personal redemption. We speak with confidence about private religious experiences, but such things leave the ordinary man cold and unresponsive. He thinks that such talk is 'Not for the

likes of him' and that it is largely a product of the religious imagination, or a figment of a metaphysical theology, and as far as life is concerned, certainly as far as he is concerned, it can be ignored as an irrelevancy to the big business which he has on hand.

Our Christian Faith had its origin in historic events and it arose in succession to the prophetic tradition which experienced God in terms of history. For the prophets there was no dualism in the universe, but God striving mightily among the nations, and contending with the recalcitrant spirit of man within the historic process. This same interpretation of the Divine Activity lies within the Gospels and the Epistles. We must challenge that division of history into sacred and secular, and claim that the whole of the historic sequence is the sphere of the Divine Activity, but that only one period of it, the period covered by the Scriptures, is lit up with spiritual significance because there were men with exceptional insight who caught the glow of the Divine Presence, understood its speech, and saw the work of God's finger in life. Maybe the bush still burns, but only those who see take off their shoes. The rest sit around and gather blackberries as Browning suggested, or discuss the abstractions and mysteries of the effulgence of the Divine Glory. Apart from our civic responsibilities, as Christian people we are not concerned about our own preservation in this present struggle, nor are we concerned first of all in maintaining the integrity of that confederacy of nations known as the British Empire, save as such organizations serve the Divine Purpose. We are not even fighting to defend the Kingdom of God, but we are fighting for the elements out of which the Kingdom of God will be built on earth. There can be no Kingdom of God on earth in answer to the prayer of Christ, save as the ideals and practices of justice, righteousness and decency are established in our midst, and respected. Above all, human life must be an organized Society within a law that is recognized by all as authoritative and regulative of life. Our social evolution is not from a state of nature to a state of grace, but from nature through law to grace, as a simple glance at the Scriptures will reveal to anyone. Our own training and the training of children is after this fashion. Law is a Divine Ordinance and is as much an instrument of the Divine Purpose as anything else we know. Before the kingdom of God can come on earth, and in its coming, it must build up social institutions, social relationships, and organized forms of justice, equality and fraternity through which, and by means of which, Divine Grace is mediated. This is not intended to exclude the experience of the mystic way, and the unmediated grace of God to the soul in fellowship with Him. Social discipline, effective education and respect for law are essential to the spiritual control and development of a people moving on in their destiny to the Kingdom of God as it is expressed on earth. No private religious experience can do for the community what God has ordained should be done through and by means of the community.

Dr. Inge reminds us that religion without history is a nervous disease. To which we may add that we are discovering in our experience that history without God is a nightmare. None of us, in these days, is allowed to be neutral, nor is anyone allowed the questionable luxury of sitting on the fence and watching this giddy world go by. We are all in it whether we like it or not. There are no spectators in this global struggle. The innocent suffer with

the guilty. Far off people are caught up in the struggle and generations unborn will experience the results of it. A God who 'Sits by us and mourns' does not meet human requirements. He is not adequate to the situation, and He makes no appeal to the ordinary man who has an intuition that God is somehow engaged in the struggle. He has an inborn assurance that Divine Activity is allied to, and comes as reinforcement, to man's moral sense. It is dangerously possible to so exalt God that He becomes the 'Immensity of supreme nothingness', and a man may become so good that he becomes good for nothing for this life, which God made, which God loves, and by which He surely means something big and important. A church may become so etherealized that it serves no earthly purpose. A theology may become so abstract that it becomes a tangled wreath of nebulosity hovering over life but forming no part of it.

If we believe in the Living God, we must recognize that the war is not only a crisis in history but a judgment of God inherent in the historic process. It calls for resistance on our part to keep open the way into that larger future, that richer form of social organization which Christ shall inherit on earth. It reveals the necessity of repentance on our part if we are going to share in that future as a people. Evil has no national boundaries, and we shall perish as a people in the purpose of God, unless our national life fits in with that purpose. We are all God's instruments. By no manner of means can we prevent God using us and our enemies for His own ends. We may become His agents, if so be that as a people we desire it and are worthy of it. Out of the varied racial elements which have gone to the making of the British people, God has taken us as His instruments, fashioned us into a united people, in this our finest hour, in protection of the purposes of God as they are expressed in history.

We must either accept the world or renounce it. Christ came not to renounce the world but to redeem it. God loves the world and He means something by it. He dwells within it. History is incarnational. Truth is found not in an abstraction of thought but in a handful of life. Our task is not to construct a theology without wrinkles and contradictions, for that were an impossibility. We may not be able to give a completely coherent account of all that is happening, and we shall have to accept and hold many a paradox in our minds, but the church is not first of all a theological institution, but a creative centre of religious activity, an inspiration, a means of grace by which the life and love and purpose of God are mediated to men. What happened to the Jesusites is a matter of small moment to the ordinary man, but what is happening to the Poles, the Chinese and the Russians weighs heavily upon his heart and he is trying to do something about it in a redemptive way. We must contend that such things weigh heavily upon the heart of God, and that we must be confident that He is doing all He can in His own way and in His own time to redeem it.

Great things have happened in our generation and we cannot afford to be silent about them. We must mediate such light and interpretation as we possess, and such confidence which our trust in the love and purpose of God affords. The only explanation which the Elizabethans could give of the destruction of the Spanish Armada was that God blew with His wind and it perished. This may not satisfy the historian, the scientist, or the theologian, but these experts cannot provide a more satisfactory interpretation of the event, when we remember how that wind settled once for all the tyranny of the Roman

Church in this land, and freed us from that imperialism which masqueraded in the Inquisition.

We shall never be able to give any better explanation of the staggering events of recent years, although men will write thousands of volumes about our times. Can anyone explain the rise into prominence of that small group of men who in these times lead the allied nations? Was there ever such a group of strong men? Whence came they? We shall never understand in human terms why the allied nations were given time to marshal their forces and array their vast resources when war was thrust upon them. Why should Germany drive East instead of West when she knew that both France and ourselves were in the conflict and unarmed? Poor Poland was hers at any moment, and Germany could have occupied her present boundaries in the West within a matter of days. What enabled our army to escape from Dunkirk? What power intervened in the Battle of Britain? Why are not our cities all in ruins, our factories destroyed, our transport system broken? Homer must be inspired when he says 'Those whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad'.

Do not events in the Far East provide us with an opportunity at last of settling once for all the question whether those vast areas and rich lands are to become subject to a pagan imperialism, or whether the people there are to move forward under the direction and protection of more enlightened nations to their destiny and prosperity?

Great changes are taking place in the outlook of men and nations and these changes are being registered in changes of policy. There is no greater miracle in all history than the abandonment of the Monroe doctrine in America. We remember that the British control of the seas kept pirates and adventuring nations away from American shores until the nation there grew up, and was able to defend itself. The American debt is an old sore, and the Cash and Carry policy is discreetly forgotten in that great act of God expressed in the Lease-Lend Act. Here is a new policy of International action which will have profound influence upon all time.

There was never such a religious awakening in the world as in these days. Men and nations are realizing, in their own way, and in their own terms, the folly of a pagan way of life and they must repent. That repentance is not expressed in the traditional language of the church, but it is expressing itself in such things as the Atlantic Charter and the Beveridge Report. Men are dreaming of a New Order, and they are working and dying to establish it.

It is a thing to be regretted that our Christian thought has been so largely preoccupied with the mystical experience of Divine Fellowship and the metaphysical abstractions of redemption. While we have been busy with these things, the thought and the recognition of God's mighty activity in life have escaped us. We have adequate thought-forms to contain a formulation of our evangelical experience, but we stammer and stutter when we come face to face, as we are to-day, with a Divine Activity in history, which we hesitate to name, because we are not as sure of it as we ought to be, and we have not created thought-forms of sufficient magnitude to express convictions about it.

The terms of our Christian purpose must be enlarged to include the redemption of the whole life. Nations and peoples are suffering and serving to-day in this great purpose of God, and our theologies ought in some measure to match

that purpose. Within our evangelical circles our terms of reference have become too small and limited to interest the ordinary man. The subject bristles with difficulties, but so does every other subject in life. Maybe, like Luther, we shall have to hold a paradox in our minds as between Divine Sovereignty and Human Freedom, but the religious interpreters of life ought to be able to give some guidance to the ordinary man about the things which he suffers, and for which he contends, even though that suffering strife moves outside the orbit of our evangelical experience.

W. H. STUBBS

A CENTENARY APPRECIATION OF SOUTHEY'S LIFE OF WESLEY

SINCE Robert Southey's *Life of Wesley* appeared in 1820, several full-sized biographies of the Founder of Methodism have been written. The later works had the advantage of seeing their subject in the larger perspective of history and of correcting errors of fact which, owing to certain manuscripts not being available, occur in the earlier writings. Notwithstanding this, no serious rival to Southey's work has appeared.

The earlier writers, contemporaries of their subject, were unbalanced in judgment, petulant or enthusiastic, often faulty in points of fact and lacking in historical sense. The later writers wrote mainly for the Methodist reader. It was a great service to the life and work of so great a man as John Wesley when the task of writing his story was undertaken by one who was the acknowledged master of letters.

The work won immediate praise from the leading figures in the world of English literature. The position it then won, it has maintained. It connects the biography with a critical judgment upon Methodism. It is difficult to see how the two could be separated, but the dual task made Southey's work more difficult than that of Boswell or Lockhart. Yet the critics value the *Life of Wesley* as one of the best examples of the art of biography.

Nor, despite the unfavourable opinions which Southey sometimes passes on their revered founder, have the Methodists been niggardly in their commendations of the work. Telford describes it as 'beautiful and appreciative' but strangely omits to mention it in the bibliography given at the close of his article in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The *New History of Methodism* places the book among British biographical classics, but refers to Southey as a 'semi-rationalistic-orthodox Anglican' — a role he surely never filled.

The *Life* also evoked hostile criticism. First came that of Alexander Knox (who has been called the link between Wesley and Cardinal Newman) pleading the unfairness of the author's imputation of personal ambition to John Wesley. Southey at once accepted Knox's evidence and promised that in a new edition of the book he would withdraw the charge. It is a pity that owing to Southey's death it was never done. The promise was renewed by the Rev. Cuthbert Southey but it has never been fulfilled. To-day, more than Methodists would agree that Richard Watson's 'Observations on Mr. Southey's Life of Wesley' contains justifiable criticism of the book. It is said that when

George IV read Watson's assault he exclaimed 'Oh, my poor poet-laureate!'

What led Robert Southey, who was temperamentally unsympathetic to the Methodist Movement, to undertake the task of writing the biography of its founder? He explained this in a letter written in 1835 to Thomas Marriott, the Methodist antiquary: 'The friars introduced me to the Methodists. I had been reading a great deal of Methodist history, both as connected with the History of Portugal and with a view to a History of the Monastic Orders; and perceiving the Methodists might be in some respects to our Church what these Orders were to the Church of Rome, I was led into a course of inquiries, the fruit of which you have now seen.'

From 1803 onwards he wrote several articles on Methodist History, and in 1807 asked his publishers: 'Is there not a new edition of Whitehead's *Life of Wesley*? If you will send me it, and with it the *Life* published by Dr. Coke for the Conference, I will either review it for you, or make a *Life* myself for the *Athenaeum*.'

Southey tells us that he was drawn to write the *Life of Cowper* because he 'entertained a sense of gratitude towards the poet'. We may feel that there was something of this, drawing him towards writing the biography of John Wesley also. Writing to Wilberforce two years before the publication of the *Life*, he says: 'I consider Wesley as the most influential mind of the last century, the man who will have produced the greatest effects centuries, perhaps millenniums, hence.'

It may be that an earlier interest operated to draw him to the task. Southey treasured a pretty childhood recollection of himself meeting the patriarchal preacher. Wesley visited the parents of Southey at their home in Bristol. He met the children on the landing, took Southey's little sister in his arms and kissed her, and, placing her on her feet again, put his hands on Robert's head and blessed him.

When Robert Southey wrote, the art of biography as a branch of English literature was still very young. It did not exist in our letters until the time of Johnson and the year 1791. It was then that the function and field of biography became defined.

First, it must be impartial. In a 'religious' biography this is particularly difficult, because emotional earnestness tends to destroy proportion in writing. Nor is biography the paying of an adulatory tribute, but (to quote an *Edinburgh Review* article on The Ethics of Biography) 'The deeds which lie in common fame must . . . be fixed down to some real person, not an abstract being'. Biography too must not be tendentious nor serve ulterior motive. It must be free from what to-day we call 'propaganda'. The writer must not intrude himself and his predilections between his subject and the reader. He must select and compose his facts and then frame his construction. He must vividly describe events both public and intimate. He must engage the active sympathy of his reader, so that with cumulative and developing force he comes to the end, where he leaves the reader with a clear unity of impression of his subject's character.

It is by these standards that we must measure Southey's *Life of Wesley*. The biographer settled to his task characteristically. He exercised great industry and care in gathering together adequate materials and testing their accuracy. He gave himself with honesty of mind to his subject and sought to dissect him

dispassionately and accurately. Following upon his critical examination, he exercised his constructive mind to present a convincing and balanced interpretation of the personality of John Wesley. Southey was the most painstaking and conscientious of biographers.

His *Life* is full of proportioned and fluent writing. It is marked by noble construction, apt selection and some powerful characterization. Southey is particularly happy in his description of the early life of Wesley. But the book is not evenly inspiring. It has some decidedly dull passages: sections where the narrative contains neither movement nor vitality. In this respect it stands in disappointing contrast to the *Life of Nelson*, where (quoting but one example) the narrative of Trafalgar is splendid in its vivid recital of events.

The main criticisms of the *Life* are, that by intellectual training the author was unable to enter sympathetically into the mind of his subject, and by temperament he was unable to divest himself of prejudice. He had an ineradicable dislike of emotional demonstration which often misdirected his judgment. In a letter to Grosvenor Bedford in which he claims that the book contains some of his best writing, Southey says 'For the religious public it will be too tolerant and philosophical'. Exactly what Southey meant by this it is hard to see, for the *Life* is marred by intolerance and lack of philosophical understanding. Temperamentally, Southey appears to have changed from the enthusiastic pantisocrat of his early post-graduate days to the high tory of Greta Hall.

It is in lack of ability to get inside his subject, thinking and feeling with him, facing sympathetically with him his ever-present practical dilemma of loyalty to the Church he loved and loyalty to the Methodist societies so often disdained by the parish clergy, that Southey fails acutely. In biography much depends on the psychological ability of the biographer — on his intellectual understanding of, and spiritual sympathy with, his subject. In this biography, we are never made to see Wesley intimately and the attempts to explain his theology are laborious and unreal. Why couldn't Southey get as close to the real Wesley as he could to the real Nelson? It was because his inner equipment was too meagre to measure the mind and experience of his subject. That was what led Richard Watson to complain: 'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with and the well is deep.'

Southey was at a disadvantage in that the evidence he gathered was at least second-hand. His retired life at Keswick, where for the greater part of the year he could have little immediate contact with persons of Methodist fellowship, experience and practice, can hardly have tended to give him the breadth of view necessary for his task. Thus he was likely to be misinformed or to have his judgement distorted by reports and the many clerical denunciations which he read.

The value of the *Life of Wesley* as pure biography is limited by the author's frequent expression of his own temperamental prejudice. It was the same prejudice in the reverse that led Augustine Birrell to write: 'Southey's *Life* is a dull, almost a stupid book which happily there is no need to read.' We are reminded of the reason A. J. Balfour gave for his inability to argue with Dr. Clifford — the Baptist divine — in the educational controversy at the beginning of the present century: 'I do not like his style!'

Referring to his *Life of Scott* Lockhart said 'It was my wish to let the character develop itself'. This, in his later chapters, Southey was not content to do. He obtrudes his own feelings, and is too confident of his own religious sense of values. He waxes violent in his contempt of John Wesley's enthusiasm. Never does the biographer approach the point when he thinks there was something laudable in Wesley's intense and passionate zeal. It was fit and proper that in his own private life the author should be reserved about intimate values and shrink from the outward expression of his religious emotions. But Southey does not stop there. He is intolerant of those whose religious self-expression operated otherwise. He is censorious of the extravagances of evangelical expression which Wesley himself did his utmost to curb. To quote but one instance, he says: 'Paroxysms were excited which were new to pathology'. Southey seems to have forgotten that St. Paul was faced with similar phenomena.

Southey is critical of the enthusiasm of faith and experience generated by Wesley's preaching. But is there not something new, great and joyous in Christian experience which calls out enthusiasm naturally? A measure of enthusiasm should have been welcomed by the biographer as a challenge to the unedifying, formal, listless services common in the Church of that day.

Our biographer, too, fails to set the revolutionary power of the Methodist enthusiasm against an adequate background of the depressed national life and the failure of the contemporary world to touch it. The aesthetic judgment of Southey's day condemned the expression of enthusiasm; nevertheless it was the emotional revolt of Methodism against the formalism of the eighteenth century that made the Romantic Movement possible. The Romantics sought the secret of Beauty *without*; the Methodists heard the voice of Reality *within*. Romanticism was an escape ethic: Methodism solved men's inward struggles by leading them to discover God within themselves. Southey's veto on enthusiasm would have choked up the channels whereby the spirit of God's love works within the life of the individual and the life of the community.

Southey accuses Wesley of the desire to 'episcopize'. Nothing can be clearer in the *Journal* than the deep and passionate attachment of Wesley to the Church of England. To the end of his long life he preached no doctrines other than those of the Church of England. Practical difficulties were thrust upon him by the antipathy of many bishops and clergy to the form of his teaching, and their unwillingness to appreciate the fact that the power of the Holy Spirit was graciously present in the Methodist Movement. Wesley wavered for a long time. Threatened with the disowning by the Church of the vast companies of men and women who had come to self-evident spiritual rebirth, Wesley was compelled to take step after step which increasingly separated the Methodists from the Mother Church. It was regrettable. It may be that Wesley, faced with episcopal prohibitions, was in some ways masterful; but the biographer does scant justice to the hard, costly, derided, forlorn way along which he had travelled. A virile Church would not have thrust him into such a dilemma.

Southey was unable to understand the profound spiritual change Wesley underwent when his heart found peace with God through a new, living faith in Christ. In describing the change, he keeps close to the account of the evangelical conversion given in Wesley's *Journal*. Later, however, he refers in crude terms to Wesley having his 'mind heated at the commencement of his

career'. That Southey was perplexed by the term 'spiritual rebirth' is borne out by the way he treats the same experience in his biographies of Cowper and Bunyan. His treatment of the evangelical experience is also an index of his dealing with the great Methodist doctrines of Justification by Faith, Assurance and Perfection. The Rev. Thomas M'Cullagh, writing of 'The Biographers of Wesley', says: 'The one writer who captivated and enchained attention, was lacking in spiritual insight and in accurate perception of the motives and aims of that devoted life.'

The world is grateful to Robert Southey for a biography in which veneration has not conquered the realist. The human Wesley is more attractive than the plaster-saint Wesley. Whilst paying high tribute to Wesley's great qualities, the biography is relentless in facing what the author judges to be his faults. He makes out his charge that the saintly Wesley was faulty in his conception of child education. He was credulous. He was lacking in prudence in his dealings with women. As to the charge that he was masterful in behaviour, Southey offers no clear proof. It was essential that in the face of certain circumstances and situations, Wesley the leader must act with decision.

Southey's *Life of Wesley* has much literary worth. It honestly attempts to fulfil the fine intention indicated in the preface. But it fails to give an adequate estimate of the character and aims of its subject. The artist's portrait is made imperfect by his own self-intrusion upon the narrative. Canon Fitzgerald says very truly: 'Southey was not well qualified either by intellect or temperament for the discussion of subtle points of theology or metaphysics.'

Southey was a writer of impeccable honesty. If he were re-writing his biography of Wesley to-day, that integrity would lead him to modify certain judgments he passed upon his subject. His imputation of personal ambition to Wesley, is a charge long since withdrawn. Probably, too, Southey would to-day withdraw the charge that Wesley deliberately intended to create a separate sect. Perhaps he would agree that there was immobility in the Church of England of Wesley's day. With the larger knowledge of psychology which we possess to-day, he would be less ruthless in his judgement upon religious enthusiasm. While maintaining the present excellent length, he would seek to give some parts of the biography more movement and brightness.

Southey's biography of John Wesley did much to raise the general estimate of the personality and influence of his subject. His interpretation is reflected in the high place since given by the historians to Wesley and the Methodist Revival. But the work lacks inspiration: it is the result achieved by industry and good craftsmanship rather than by an act of great creative energy moving over the gathered historical material. Southey himself described it as 'this great tessellated tablet' and that word emphasizes the artificial nature of the construction.

There is still room for a book that will become the classic life of Wesley, but it may be that Robert Southey's *Life* will remain unchallenged.

SAMUEL DAVIS

THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF TOWN PLANNING

IN the past, enthusiasts for town planning reform have stressed the effects of environment on health and economic conditions. Much less reference has been made to the equally serious effects of environment on character and morals.

This is primarily due to the difficulty of collecting evidence about these effects. The fact that the evidence is lacking, does, however, suggest that this relationship has not been sufficiently admitted for the difficulties to be tackled and overcome. The depressing nature of many housing schemes has been a well-disguised benefit in that it has brought about a realization of the fact that environment does affect mental and spiritual welfare. Certain other broad hints of relationship are to be seen, but there is little reliable evidence, such as could give a clear picture of the evils caused.

This evidence must be gathered if our hopes for post-war rebuilding are to be realized, even in part. There is danger in the fact that not all responsible for planning, both as regards policy and application, admit the need of such facts. This might mean that a major instrument for preconditioning the future of our social structure would be administered without vision, even administered toward party or sectarian ends.

Most planning technicians, however, are aware of these dangers and what evidence can be produced is being used. The danger is rather that the public and their elected representatives will demand results before all the evidence is collected and collated. If that should happen it is not improbable that all our efforts to achieve the fuller life we hope for, will come to nought.

An examination of certain evidence regarding the relationship of environment and character is revealing, both as regards the need for town planning and the way in which bad planning can prejudice the issue.

Class consciousness has grown steadily, most notably in urban areas, since the middle of the nineteenth century. Since 1919 this social division has proceeded much more rapidly. A study of the development of towns and cities during this period shows that the upper and middle classes have moved out to new suburban areas. In 1919 this migration was accelerated by the creation of great areas of one-class housing which resulted in continued class segregation. During this period also, class consciousness has become dangerously near to class warfare.

Which is cause and which effect is not easy to determine. Prior to the suburban drift the classes lived in the same or contiguous areas. With the change large blighted areas began to appear. These were labelled 'working class' — a title which should have been of honour but was actually a stigma.

The blight increased because the land had to earn its rent, and since industry was demanding more and more space only overdevelopment could meet the new rents. This brought squalor, but it brought labour and new works were opened if labour was plentiful and land values rose still higher. As the squalor increased, the few good tenants were forced out and the properties deteriorated further.

In this way a most dangerous trend in social grouping became firmly

embodied in the urban pattern of Great Britain, and there was created the paradoxical situation whereby redevelopment of slum areas is impossible owing to high land values, these high values being due to the excess number of people per acre, which in turn is the reason why the place is a slum. It is not surprising that evacuees were as ignorant of table linen as their hosts were incredulous at seeing verminous children!

The decline in neighbourhood consciousness was contemporaneous. Previously communities grew slowly; absorbed newcomers and allowed people to make their home among like spirits. In addition, any division into classes was a mere matter of living at different ends of the same street. The housing needs of the industrial revolution were met by the creation of miles of dwellings. No attempt was made to create homes or communities. In 1919 another chance came but once again only houses were provided.

The need to have a place to live drove people to areas where they knew nobody, where they had no desire to live, and where amenities were reduced to bare essentials. In the industrial revolution lack of transport forced people to make homes and communities of their drab areas. In the later phase transport made the new estates mere dormitories. People could sleep there and live the rest of their lives elsewhere. Such people felt no responsibility for their neighbourhood and had the scantiest of interest in their neighbours. This has led to the irresponsible attitude which youth has toward all property. Our scientific genius has not found any substitute for the moral restraint of local pride.

The decline in the influence of the home is an accepted fact but there is the same difficulty in deciding whether environment or various other factors are the cause.

One point is obvious. By creating great housing estates, devoid of amenities, and divorced from their parent city, we have made it impossible for those who would to create homes. Furthermore, the concentration of industry and commerce in big urban centres has made it necessary for many young people either to leave home, or to spend an excessive amount of time travelling. For practically all our working population and many school children the midday meal at home no longer exists. Such a distortion of normal life cannot take place without some social consequence.

The breaking up of homes and the dispersal of population have speeded up the decline in church attendance. Changes in custom and the spread of agnosticism are basic factors in this decline, but it cannot be denied that the church's efforts to stem the drift are useless unless the church building is sited where the church members live. This decline in the influence of religion generally, could be described as spiritual disintegration. It is symptomatic of our restless age. It has, however, been much accelerated by failure to give new housing areas any kind of spiritual centre.

This does not mean that careful siting of churches will re-integrate spiritual life once more. The fact must be accepted that the churches have ceased to be truly representative of the people. This means that the churches must be prepared to work through an alternative centre to recapture men and women. That achieved, and it is far from an unfertile field we have to work in, a new integration of spiritual life will bring a new era of cathedral building.

If we admit that environment does have an important effect on social

problems, then town planning is more than important. It is an instrument with potentialities for both good and evil, all depending on the motives which inspire it and the principles which control it. It is, therefore, the duty of all professing Christians who are concerned about good government to ensure that the motives and principles are in accordance with the Christian ethic.

A close examination of both past planning and the present state of proposals shows that there are four traps for those who become enthusiastic for town planning reform.

The first of these traps is simply a desire for tidiness. Our town and country pattern has grown bit by bit and only a thorough study can reveal the underlying perfection of the natural pattern. If that study is not undertaken the simplest solution to the problem seems to be to tidy it all up. Tidying up means the re-creation of towns according to formal patterns, the provision of trim lawns, flower beds, unity in street façades and carefully arranged vistas.

It means, too, unifying the form of land tenure, spreading the population according to a paper plan and deploying industry like well disciplined soldiers. There can only be one end to such planning. That is regimentation. It would make it simple for any dictatorial group to gain control of the country.

This is one of the most insidious threats to true democracy. So long as small communities of individuals handle their own domestic affairs, co-operating with like communities when necessary, there will be mistakes and inefficiency. Central control might increase efficiency but at the price of losing the original contributions which individuals make to our society.

This is particularly so in regard to town planning. The beauty of our towns and countryside is the natural outcome of individuals co-operating voluntarily. It could never have come about by centralization of all planning which so many seem to want. Such planning would achieve efficiency, but it would be soulless efficiency.

The next trap is the antithesis of order. It comes from the zealous endeavours of small groups each emphasizing one aspect of town planning. It may be the plea is for new towns; it may be the plea is for rural preservation. Whatever the plea the pleaders are vocal and insistent.

All such pleas are good in themselves, and justify the zeal shown for them. The danger lies in the fact that each reform is but one part of town planning and enthusiasts may gain undue prominence for their particular enthusiasm. Rural preservation is such a case. It is an excellent thing that our countryside should be preserved. Over insistence, however, might mean that rural preservation was ensured at the expense of living conditions, or the need of alternative employment in the winter months. Countrymen are not always in sympathy with the sentimental type of rural preservationist.

In the same way the desire to plan for the individual must be watched. There are 45 million individuals in the United Kingdom and town planning must be for the good of them all, therefore enthusiasm for freedom must be tempered with consideration of the right relationship to the freedom of others.

The third trap is probably the most dangerous. If town planning is to be well done there will be much preparatory work which has no publicity value. If our elected legislators are swayed by their own and their electors' impatience they will prefer immediate measures to make a show rather than long term plans.

In this way many of the difficulties will disappear, but they will recur a hundredfold at a later date. Patience must be exercised and if action is imperative before the preliminaries are properly completed, then temporary measures must suffice. The quick way in town planning is always dangerous because only by an exhaustive study of what is, can the town planner estimate future development and so provide the plan to encourage it along right lines.

Finally there is the trap of wanting to copy, the plea for the adoption of methods used in Russia, America and elsewhere. This tendency to copy is widespread and dangerous. These systems, such as the linear planning of Russian towns, were worked out for people, circumstances and social structure peculiar to their country of origin. We, too, must study our country in three aspects; what is, what might be, and the people for whom we plan. Once these facts are absorbed we can gain much from a close study of the work of others, but the plea of wholesale adoption is a dangerous fad.

The way to guard against these, and other traps is to get the motives and principles of town planning quite clear.

For Britain there is one motive, and only one. Town planning must provide the right background for that social structure which makes it possible for each person to live, fully, to the glory of God and in service to his fellow men.

Three principles help to keep town planning to that aim. Firstly planning must be for the individual and each individual citizen must be allowed to share in that work in so far as he is capable of doing so. Secondly, the means adopted must be in harmony with the aim they are intended to achieve. Finally, the work must be carried out in accordance with Christian principles.

The task of planning according to these high principles is not easy. To persuade the committees and technicians, who are the planners, to adopt them is ten times as hard, but if men of right purpose will try, it can be done.

The principles must be clearly understood. Planning for the individual should mean planning for the fullest and freest development of each personality. Freedom, however, must be conditional on some form of social order. That social order must be the result of the varied contributions of free individuals in accordance with the Christian way of life.

The principles grasped, each proposal for the re-ordering of our environment can be judged in their light. It will be found that many proposals, such as making the community and not the parents responsible for children, by nurseries, restaurants and youth centres, are in opposition to the principles. Such proposals must be opposed in favour of others which mature more slowly, but accord with the principles; for instance the careful grouping of home, work and amenities to permit children to grow up in their home and the immediate neighbourhood.

Thinking people, aware of their social responsibilities, will, when conscious of any proposal's shortcomings, know how to give effect to their views. They must make certain that town planning committees and their technical officers are aware of these shortcomings.

Much can be done by urging the committees responsible for this work to give some thought to motives and principles when appointing town planning staff. The town planner is generally conscious of his social responsibility. He is not always sure of how his committee see that responsibility. The committee

can help themselves and him by stating the motive of their town planning.

A great responsibility rests on all officially concerned with planning. More fully informed about the technicalities, they are the true shapers of the background. It is imperative that their motives are sound, and here the layman can help by endeavouring to make certain that the right type of man is entrusted with this work.

The responsibility rests on all of us. We must discharge it well. To do that we must keep ourselves informed about town planning, aware of its consequences and conscious of its principles.

In conclusion it is worth while to recall an incident in the life of Heine. He was standing with a friend admiring the glories of the cathedral at Amiens. His friend asked him if he could explain why their generation did not build like that. Heine replied:

My dear Alphonse, these men had a conviction, we moderns have only opinions. You cannot build like that with opinions.

What was the conviction which those medieval builders had? Was it not just an honest, straightforward faith that God was good, that they were His instruments and that this, their work, was the fit place and manner to show their joy in the Lord and all His works?

Whatever their conviction was, we of to-day will need a like conviction, deep-seated and firmly held, if we are to achieve the results we hope for from the enormous task of post-war reconstruction. It will be a difficult task and a long one. There is one hopeful sign. The great cathedrals arose at a time when Europe was emerging from the dark ages and men were seeking a new life. The church entered into their daily lives and influenced them for good. To-day men are seeking once again, and if the church can again go into their lives their search may be ended.

In town planning is the hope for a new environment. The church, as a structure, must have a place in that environment. Thinking people can, by unceasing endeavour, persuade those in authority to examine thoroughly the questions of environment and social conduct with a view to finding how the task of town planning can be made an opportunity to recreate the community life of Britain.

If this is done men will know once again the need for a spiritual centre to their community. A new era of church building will come and the open doors of new cathedrals will gather in the aspirations of men and their spires will point those aspirations ever higher.

HENRY J. CRONE

THE BIBLICAL ROOTS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

'CHRISTIAN theology is the grandmother of Bolshevism.' The dictum is Oswald Spengler's, and his meaning is surely clear enough. Bolshevism derives from Christian doctrine, but with an intermediate link in the shape of the Hegelian philosophy. The Biblical teaching of a living God who governs history was first watered down to the triumphal progress of Reason, stage by stage. Marx then carried the process a step further, substituting 'economic necessity' for Reason, and seeing in the forces of production those factors which

determine human life in all its aspects, and which are destined ultimately to redeem it. We can say that what happened was that Hegel translated an essentially religious conviction into the language of philosophy, whereupon Marx translated it out of philosophy into economics. Of course, that took place which was to be expected; by the time the work of translation was over, the deviation from the original was so considerable that those who were responsible for it denied that there was any connection therewith. That is where the Bolsheviks stand to-day.

This same process of deterioration can be observed in other directions. For example, our freedoms of speech and of the Press go back to the claim which our fathers made for freedom of conscience. The religious sphere is the one in which men first vindicate liberty, then they transfer the claim to other spheres: but it is all too easy for what began in this way to end up as mere private caprice.

We may generalize from these two instances and say that political ideas which have a transforming effect upon civilization have usually arisen in the first instance from some conviction of a religious order, and that the farther they have travelled from the point at which they began, the more liable are they to abuse. Mannheim has pointed out in his *Ideology and Utopia* that the beginning of politics in the present-day sense of the word, as the concern of the people for the welfare of the people, was with the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation. Our schemes and programmes are ultimately so many secularized versions of their hope of the Kingdom of God upon earth.

If it is true that there is this connection between religion and politics and that the health of the one depends upon the degree to which it still retains contact with the other, it follows that times of stock-taking will be needed again and again, times in which we seek to rediscover and revive the basic conviction which lies behind our political aspirations. And surely the present is just such a time.

The particular instance of the relation between religion and politics with which I am now concerned is that of international law. One root of this is in the Bible. So much is clear, and it may well be that the reason why the plant to-day presents so sorry and withered a spectacle is that we have torn it up from that root and transplanted it in strange soil.

Most of us, I suppose, when in days of peace we were called upon to deal with this subject, turned for our lesson to the glowing passage in Isaiah or Micah in which the prophet describes how nations will one day come to an end of the art and the implements of war. I suggest that there is a passage which would serve our purpose much better: it is that in which Amos denounces Moab for its crimes against Edom.

Thus saith the Lord: For three transgressions of Moab, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime.

To be sure, what is described here is no more than an incident in the border-warfare of two half-civilized tribes; but it brings before us the basic principles which alone can give stability to nations.

We stand to-day amid the wreckage of one world-order and amid vague hopes for the creation of another and more enduring one. The League of

Nations is in a state of suspended animation, and there must be few who anticipate that it will be revived in anything like the old form. Rival plans are being sponsored and advocated; we hear from one quarter of Federal Union, and from another of a Council of Europe working in conjunction with a Council of Asia. But there is a widespread awareness that none of these proposed arrangements will be adequate to the fierce and perilous situation of the post-war years unless it is accompanied by some sort of spiritual renewal, some common faith which will give men zest and loyalty in the service of the institutions they create and which will ensure that these institutions are employed for worthy ends. Let us go back over 2,700 years in quest of this, and we shall find what we need in the illumination which came to a Hebrew prophet and the word he was charged to speak to his generation, because in this there is a Word of God for our own time.

The first truth set out in this oracle against Moab is that of the unity and character of God. Of the religion of Edom we know little or nothing, but we know that Moab honoured a tribal god by the name of Chemosh. In Moab, Edom, and Israel alike the common man was apt to think of his god as one whose writ only ran within his own territory; in what happened outside his own dominion he had no right of intervention, unless indeed he were conducting a campaign at the head of his armies. Amos here takes the momentous step of challenging such a notion, as far as the God of Israel at least is concerned. Since Moab and Edom alike are men, they are subject to Him as the one great God who takes cognizance of all mankind. What though Israel is not in any way affected by their action, the crime of man against man is a crime against Him.

In all this, it is no abstract principle of monotheism that is being asserted; the nations are confronted with a moral authority which overrides all other claims. Amos is the spokesman of a supra-national kingdom in which the contending states of the Near East fall into their places as so many provinces, and within which their animosities must bear the guilt of fratricide. And this God overrides too those differences of creed which separate men as much and as grievously as national differences; the contentions of religion can in fact be fiercer than any other. True, neither Edom nor Moab acknowledges the God of Israel. But what of that? He acknowledges them, and enforces against them both the claims of an absolute righteousness. If there is to be any system of international law, there must be found an impartial third party to adjudicate in disputes. Amos finds such a third party already in God, God who calls to account the contending peoples, whether they acknowledge Him or deny Him.

In the second place, we have clearly affirmed here the universality of conscience. The particular crime of which the prophet speaks may strike us as no more than a political blunder, but in the ancient world it was a horrid atrocity. When Cromwell's bones were dug up and handed over to the common hangman, that was no more than a symbolic action, indicating that the new regime branded as a traitor the man who had been Lord Protector of England. But more was meant in this case; not only was the person concerned affected after death in consequence of the desecration of his grave, but the welfare of his descendants and the security of his nation were imperilled by what was done. We could scarcely find anywhere else a more apt illustration of the limitations

which attend upon conscience, and at the same time of its inherent power. It is at once conditioned by the stage of development which men have reached and charged with an authority from beyond all such conditions.

The prophets do not use our word 'conscience': if they did, they would use it with a different meaning from the one we usually attach to it. It suggests to us what separates man from man, whereas the prophets would mean by it rather what binds all men together. We think at once in this connection of some personal idiosyncrasy which distinguishes one individual from others, a scruple which the rest of us find it difficult to appreciate, but which we are prepared to tolerate. What men like Amos have in mind is that awareness of moral obligation which they believe to be in every man, something which takes precedence not only of the will-to-power, but even at times of the will-to-live. At the moment, no doubt, this is openly denied; but the denial is useless, for even the tyrant and the traitor are forced in the end to appeal in their own perverse fashion to the universal human conscience. The possibility of finding a law which will one day govern the nations is grounded on the faith that already there is a law of God which is written on all men's hearts.

Finally, in these words the prophet gives expression to his conviction that the universe is a moral order. This, indeed, is that of which he speaks with most certainty; for him the universe is so made that in the long run wrong-doing cannot but bring destruction upon those who are responsible for it.

I will send a fire upon Moab, and it shall devour the palaces of Kerioth; and Moab shall die with tumult, with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet: and I will cut off the judge from the midst thereof, and will slay all the princes thereof with him, saith the Lord.

That the world is in the last resort a moral order — this is something which men cannot give up. They may postpone wellnigh indefinitely the fulfilment of this hope, but they cannot abandon it wholly — that would be to make life henceforth intolerable. There is something, after all, in Dryden's words: 'I have heard indeed of some virtuous persons who have ended unfortunately, but never of any virtuous nation; Providence is engaged too deeply when the cause becomes so general.' It was the glory of the Hebrew prophets that they asserted the righteousness of God in His rule of the world even when that righteousness had to be directed against their own people — and His.

Of course, the inference to be drawn from this conviction is not that we should sit back and do nothing, leaving the laws of the moral universe to work themselves out of their own accord. The message that runs through the Bible is that just because God is active, we His servants should be active also and in a similar way. Amos bids the society of his time reproduce in its own life that righteousness which is the ultimate law of the universe. Behind his passion for justice lies his certainty that God is for ever engaged in championing the poor and the oppressed, in uprooting the evil in the world as He bids men uproot it in their own social life. If we ask what is the final reason why we should seek to make righteousness the supreme law of nations, the answer is that God Himself has already made it such.

We are all aware that our task is to find the essentials of an international order; if we fail in this, we shall be swept away by the avalanche of the third

world war, or our children will be. To the making of that order the politician will of necessity bring his schemes, the economist his advice, and the common people their fears and their rebellion against a destiny which seems to condemn them afresh in each generation to hideous strife. But some of us must see to it that other and better material than these is brought to the building: there must be certain great convictions and great truths with which to work. These truths are those described here: the unity and character of God, the universality and sovereignty of conscience, and the universe as a moral order. Centuries have gone by since expression was first given to these truths, but all that has happened since does but serve to authenticate them, and we discern in them to-day a revelation from God, to reject which is to perish.

E. L. ALLEN

UNREALIZED IDEALS

WHAT an extraordinary entity is a moral ideal! Few people have made any conscious effort to create it, but every person possesses it. Experience may have furnished the elements which compose it, but as a constituted whole it is a unique mental production, as distinctive as a man's individuality. There is permanency at its core, but it is not static; it grows with our growth, ever towers above our achievements and beckons us to higher endeavours. It differs from conscience, but is vitally connected with it; for if it does not exercise the imperative command 'Thou shalt', it embodies what is commanded and adds a persuasive force which helps to determine conduct. The moral ideal is one of those characteristics which lift man above the rest of God's creatures, and asserts that his differences from them are as emphatic as his resemblances to them. There is no evidence that any animal has a parallel capacity. That the imperfect nature of man should project a presentation of his own self loftier than his attainments, which harmonizes with the imperative demands of his conscience, which implies a freedom of choice amid various standards of conduct, and which, when freedom is wrongly exercised, witnesses to its defectiveness, is a fact outside the realms of physics and physiology, which justifies us in placing the origin and constitution of the moral ideal in a spiritual order of things.

Because man is a moral being the moral ideal throws its lustre over the whole of his voluntary life. There are always two ways of performing even acts that appear morally neutral, and we are never left in doubt as to which is right. Besides, we Christians are familiar with the story of three men who on a mountain in Judea saw the divine image of our humanity transformed in a vision of heavenly glory. His face was as the sun and His raiment as the light. So wonderfully impressive was the sight that they could only say 'It is good to be here', and express a wish to stay. But another voice came from a cloud of overhanging brightness: 'This is my beloved Son, hear Him.' Since that day, increasing numbers of men have found that when their own ideal of life has been brought into contact with Jesus Christ, the good in it naturally coalesces with Him and is purified, and by His infusion into it of a richer content it is elevated and extended; in other words, He becomes their ideal.

A worthy ideal has a value all its own. It is not too much to say that we begin

our thinking life as dreamers and idealists; we paint the future, both for ourselves and our friends, in the rosiest of colours, and set out to realize it with light hearts and high hopes. This is as it should be, for life without hope is barren. The ideal reveals our possibilities and gives birth to lofty purposes. It is the vision of what he may become that leads the youth to make those high resolves and determined efforts that proclaim the man in him. The height of his ambition may never be reached, but he will have to thank the vision of it that he ever moved out of the valley. We are all slaves in Egypt dominated by fleeting passions and impulses, until the prospect of Canaan stirs our hearts; then we set out to reach the promised land even though it lie across the trackless desert. If men have carried out great social reforms, become successful as scholars, or built up large businesses, it is because they have first dreamed of these things and then made the dream their life's inspiration. To get the best out of individuals or societies you must fire their enthusiasm by some bold enterprise which will tax their resources. Duty is a noble motive, but it is cold. The lad who goes to his books because he feels he ought to do so will be outclassed by his friend who has a definite object in view. A Christian Church may continue to hold its own so long as each member does his best; but until it has a nobler aim, it will move in the old ruts. Work for a great thing and you will do something, narrow your plans and you will dwarf your souls. The commonplace stirs no enthusiasm; that is why individuals and Churches should always have some special task on hand.

There is a vital connection between a man's aim in life and his method of living. The principle is the means he employs must be adequate to the end he expects to achieve; therefore a noble purpose demands a noble life. A good desire condemns everything inconsistent with it, even refuses to be satisfied except by honest endeavours; consequently, a worthy ideal tends to ennoble and purify the soul. It strengthens the will, focuses activities that would otherwise be dissipated, teaches us to use time rightly, and fortifies the soul against meanness and selfishness. Thus few things are more helpful than to live day by day under the influence of some worthy purpose.

Truth compels us to acknowledge facts that set the ideal in a less attractive light. Success demands that personality and environment shall approach something like harmony, so that the inherent powers of a man's soul shall find an opportunity of self expression. Thus a man of active temperament avoids the occupation that necessitates sitting still day by day, and he who has a studious disposition shuns the bustle of the crowd. Still, we are all liable to circumstances that baffle our designs and mar our efforts, and too many have to live and work in surroundings out of harmony with their feelings and desires. A member of one of my churches was a man whose native endowments and untiring zeal left no doubt of his fitness for the Christian ministry, but poverty destined him to be a tinsmith. The lowest walks of life can furnish poets whose only lack is education, musicians who cannot afford an instrument, and men born to rule who have never held a sphere of influence. A young woman in a northern port had six brothers, all sailors, as their male ancestors had been for generations. The call of the sea was in her blood too, and she confessed that to be a sailor was the strongest desire of her life; but she could only walk the beach with Tennyson's words in her heart:

Break, break, break, on the cold grey stones, O Sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter the thoughts that arise in me.

Ambitious parents often send children to learn trades and professions for which they have no aptitude. The unfortunate sufferers long for something better, but by the time they are old enough to choose for themselves it is too late to begin anew: thus they are compelled to go through life with their whole nature in rebellion against their work. Such people cannot do their best, while the thought of what they might have been makes life almost intolerable.

One of the tragedies of this war is the destruction of the hopes of young people who were or are laying the foundations of their life's work. University careers are broken into, apprenticeships are postponed, and prospective callings suppressed as being unessential to the national purpose. Newly established businesses are abandoned, marriages have been deferred, and where they have taken place young wives and children are left alone. When peace comes it will be impossible to gather up all the old strands, and life will demand a new outlook. Nor is it the young alone whose ideals have been shattered, their disappointment is shared by men and women who have faithfully pursued some worthy purpose for a working lifetime. Some about to receive the reward of their toil have been smitten with disease, others have had the dearest treasure of their hearts snatched away and cannot be comforted, and others vainly struggle to conceal the fear and worry that undermines the strength of body and mind. Then we must add to these the people who have devoted themselves to the pursuit of wealth, pleasure, or fame, and have missed the secret of quiet confidence and contentment. In trying to do the great things we often neglect what we call the minor duties of home, Church and friendship; yet the small duties pave the main road to high purposes.

Does this mean that failure is inevitable? By no means: the ideal beyond our reach is a witness of our greatness. In all of us there is more than we can reveal and a man's real self is not simply what he is, but what he longs to become. The painter cannot place on the canvas the picture he has in his mind's eye, the manuscript of the musician only imperfectly records the melodies which have stirred his heart, and we all feel the difficulty of expressing our holiest thoughts and aspirations in practical life. The Christian knows that the rounded perfection of the life of Jesus Christ is a better revelation of his spirit's longings than the feeble, broken efforts of his own will. Outward acts are no true measure of a man's intentions and desires; and so we may be sure that God will not condemn us without taking into account the conditions of our life's work. Circumstances may burden us, men may scorn us because we have not reached their standard; but God 'alone decidedly can try us'. He knows all we intended to be and still would be, if we could. It is not easy to submit to the ungenial; but if we must, let us do our best, remembering that God knows all.

Then, too, although the ideal is an individual thing, in the practical work of attaining it we are deeply affected by our fellow-men. We can accomplish nothing in isolation, but the extent to which we are helped or hindered by others no man can decide. At present, the conflict between the aims of individuals and the conditions forced upon them by social and international rela-

tions is responsible for failure, suffering, and destructive waste of human talent to an appalling measure. It challenges our faith, but my belief is that the wise and just God in whom we trust will provide us with the chance of being and doing our best. We can put no limits to our capacity for knowledge, goodness, and service; and one reason for our belief in immortality is its necessity for the development of the image in which God has created us and that no man shall fail through lack of opportunity.

It is worth while remembering that God has never commanded us to succeed; but to be faithful, which is within the reach of all. We are surrounded by the mysteriously unknown and undefined, limiting our knowledge and restraining our activities; what terrors and dangers it may conceal we know not, but we feel impelled to risk them. What would be the worth of life, if we never ventured beyond our strength and vision? Since the day when Abraham felt it better to go into the unknown with a personal God than to stay in safety with a worn-out creed, brave men have not asked for success, but only for a worthy cause. That is what God offers to all of us; so if we have failed, let us start again in the strength of the promise 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life'.

JOHN T. NEWTON

G. K. CHESTERTON: THE MAN AND HIS WORK

OF all the great writers, Montaigne and R.L.S. not excepted, G. K. Chesterton was perhaps the most consistently autobiographical. He squeezed the orange of experience and poured its generous juices with unstinting hand to slake his readers' thirst. Did he sprain an ankle? take a taxi-cab; or a ramble on the downs; or by the shore? Does he change his residence? Each episode, however trivial in itself, furnished material for his teeming brain. And each in turn, beneath his wizard hands, suffered 'a sea-change, into something rich and strange'. For of no man are Browning's words more true: 'He at least believed in soul, was very sure of God.' The well-known mot about the seeker after lodgings, that his chief inquiry should be as to his landlady's views about the universe, is the key to his own outlook on life. He hitched the wagon of everyday life to a star. It is something of a paradox, then, that in the writings of one so frankly and exuberantly communicative concerning himself, the passage that most accurately and succinctly sums up his own life should have been one of the few in which he was not being intentionally autobiographical. He is speaking in *The Everlasting Man* of the wandering life of our Lord, comparing and contrasting it with those of others like Apollonius of Tyana and Socrates. 'Most even of the great philosophers', he goes on, 'give us a vague impression of having very little to do except to walk and talk.'¹ Could anything more happily sum up Chesterton's own career? From boyhood to death he talked. Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, in her book on the two brothers, has told us of the interminable discussions that filled their boyhood's days. And the boy was father of the man. He talked on the platform and in the Press; for twenty-five years he talked every week to the readers of the *Illustrated London*

¹ *The Everlasting Man*, p. 235. Published by Hodder & Stoughton. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

News; and even his books are like extracts from that ceaseless torrent of inspired talk.

And as he talked, he walked. His intellectual development was a spiritual odyssey aptly typified in book after book of his most characteristic writings. *The Flying Inn*, *The Ball and the Cross*, *The Man Who Was Thursday*, and *Manalive* are all books of movement. Their principal characters roam the roads of the world in endless talk, in ceaseless invasion of the stagnant places where false philosophies have cast a spell upon the minds and lives of men.

'A cloud was on the minds of men, and wailing went the weather,
Yea, a sick cloud upon the soul when we were boys together.
Science announced nonentity and art admired decay;
The world was old and ended: but you and I were gay.'¹

And travel that was invasion means fighting.

I was ever a fighter; so one fight more
The best and the last

might have been the watchword of this paladin of the Faith. So that the fact that *The Napoleon of Notting Hill* happens to be cast into the forms of battle and not travel does not in the least impair its fitness as a symbol of its author's life. From his youthful encounters with Mr. Blatchford in *The Clarion* to his latest onslaughts on opponents like Dean Inge and Bishop Barnes, he lived amid the almost ceaseless clamour of controversy. In *Heretics* he hesitated not to touch with his spear point the shields of such redoubtable champions as Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Tolstoi, and Kipling.

And this is the more amazing in the light of what Chesterton has told us of his own early doubts and all-but despair. 'My morbidities were mental as well as moral; and sounded the most appalling depths of fundamental scepticism and solipsism.'² It was of this period that he later wrote in the strange story of *The Man Who Was Thursday*. In an early study of Chesterton, written some twenty years ago, Mr. John Freeman, the poet and critic, asks: 'Is it not odd, indeed, that the most garrulous and expansive of authors should never speak of himself? Scarce any writer of our time has spared so insignificant a fraction of autobiography.'³ To this inquiry (so flatly contradictory of the opening of the present article), the answer, surely, is now sufficiently clear. Chesterton did tell us of himself. *The Man Who Was Thursday* is G. K. Chesterton. Adam Wayne and Auberon Quin, Innocent Smith and the Wild Knight, all are G. K. Chesterton. George Meredith did not more frankly lift the veil in *Evan Harrington* than Chesterton in this amazing series of autobiographical disclosures. And it is of the abysmal humility of the man that he gave them the form of fiction. Nothing could have been further from the nature of Chesterton than to thrust these dark and tortured questionings upon his readers as a mere private and personal experience of his own. In his faith that they had a larger

¹ Dedication to *The Man Who Was Thursday*. Published by J. W. Arrowsmith. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

² *Autobiography*, p. 341. Published by Messrs. Hutchinson & Co. Ltd. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

³ *English Portraits and Essays*, p. 17. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.

than any private interest, that they reflected the common doubts and questionings of the soul, he gave them to the world confident that they would find the readers for whom they were meant.

Mr. Freeman was not the only reader whom they failed to 'find'. Dr. Robertson Nicoll as 'A Man of Kent' devoted a lengthy notice to *Manalive* on its appearance. Here are some of his opening sentences: 'Mr. Chesterton can afford to have the truth told to him, and the truth is that the book is a total, unredeemed, blank failure. It is the very worst of all Mr. Chesterton's novels, and that is saying a great deal. Valueless from every point of view, . . . ' That was in 1912. Now note Time's *Reveries*. Most readers of this organ cherish the name of that gifted son of the Methodist Church, the late A. E. Whitham. Towards the end of the thirties the present writer heard A. E. Whitham in his happiest vein deliver a lecture crammed with laughter and wisdom, and based almost entirely on an old book published some quarter of a century earlier, and found valueless from every point of view by one of the greatest bookmen of his day — G. K. Chesterton's *Manalive*. Surely the story is worthy of a place in some treasury of curiosities of criticism.

II

What, let us now ask, were some of the secrets of Chesterton's strength? What are the resources on which he drew?

First of all, he is, par excellence, the poet. He is indeed a dozen things besides — artist, editor, playwright, writer of some of the best detective stories of the day, a literary critic of first-rate order, a vigorous advocate of social reconstruction, a no less forceful and original writer on religious questions, but always, inspiring and illuminating every department of his writing there is that quality of vision and energy of utterance that stamps the poet. Though the proportion of his verse to his prose writings be but small, yet his poetic powers inform all he has to say.

At the same time it is not too much to say that Chesterton owes his superb achievement to his religious faith. He is reported to have declared of himself whilst still quite a young man that he was 'prancing with faith'. The Christian Faith, reached through so much travail of brain and soul, was for him no dull, vague, leaden-hued affair, lurking like fog somewhere in the hinterland of his mind. Like a sun it has penetrated, stimulated, heightened, and invigorated every faculty and fibre of his nature. Some of his earliest writing was apologetic. But it was immeasurably removed from the tame and conventional type of religious argument. Chesterton took the field against his rationalistic antagonists with something of the uproarious hilarity of a schoolboy out for a holiday. He advocated the Christian view not only with a vigour of argument embarrassingly cogent; but with a kind of gargantuan mirth that bewildered and confounded his adversaries:

A mass of legend and literature, which increases and will never end, has repeated and rung the changes on that single paradox; that the hands that had made the sun and stars were too small to reach the heads of the cattle. Upon this paradox, we might almost say upon this jest, all the literature of our faith is founded. It is at least like a jest in this that it is something which

the scientific critic cannot see. He laboriously explains the difficulty which we have always defiantly and almost derisively exaggerated; and mildly condemns as improbable something that we have almost madly exalted as incredible, something that would be much too good to be true, except that it is true.¹

But where, in all this, it may be asked, is the argument? the proof? And the inquiry would point us to perhaps the deepest, the ultimate truth with regard to this whole matter of controversy concerning the faith. Namely, that the attitude of the soul to questions of religion is not fundamentally determined by the intellect in isolation from the rest of man's complex make-up. Two men confront the whole confused material of human life, thought, and experience. And one man espouses an agnostic or even atheistic conclusion; the other exultantly embraces the Christian account of the whole.

III

Leaving now this early period of battle waged on behalf of the faith we come to the most powerful and fruitful period of Chesterton's work, the period from the publication of *Orthodoxy* in 1909 to his entrance into the Roman Church in 1922. The Christian Faith is now not so much the cause he is championing as the spiritual arsenal that supplies him with war material. He has put on the whole armour of God. And never doughtier knight rode into the lists than this gay and gallant soldier of the living God. What are the causes for which he fights? Broadly they may be distinguished as two. And, queerly enough, at first blush they might well seem to belong to opposite camps. For one is the essential splendour and goodness of human life as God would have it be; the other is the attack he directs against the unspeakable abominableness of many of the conditions of modern life. A *Daily News* article, 'The Two Noises', reprinted in his finest volume of essays, *Tremendous Trifles*, dramatizes and elucidates his outlook. The article is noteworthy in more than one respect. It affords one of the choicest examples of his prose style. And it incorporates verses of a haunting tenderness and beauty. Here are two of them (his thought is of his country):

I know the bright baptismal rains,
I love your tender troubled skies,
I know your little climbing lanes
Are peering into Paradise,
From open hearth to orchard cool
How bountiful and beautiful.

(O throttled and without a cry,
O strangled and stabbed, you shall not die,
The frightful word is on your walls,
The east sea to the west sea calls,
The stars are dying in the sky,
You shall not die; you shall not die.)²

¹ *Everlasting Man*, p. 191. Published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton Ltd. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

² *Tremendous Trifles*, pp. 170-1. Published by Messrs. Methuen & Co. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

Yes, the opposition between the two halves of Chesterton's gospel is but in seeming. A Christian not only can hold both, he may well find it impossible not to. Let us glance rapidly at these two opposite poles of Chesterton's teaching in turn.

1. All Christians are familiar with that huge and staggering affirmation of our faith 'that the things which are seen have not been made from things that do appear'. The universe cannot account for itself. 'We believe in God, Maker of heaven and earth.' Every modern mind is equally familiar with the rationalistic view which denies the creative activity of deity and sees sheer iron necessity everywhere merely because of the deadly regularity and uniformity of nature. Our minds are cowed and browbeaten by the routine of nature into missing any living creative Presence in it. Not so Chesterton.

2. One of the shallowest criticisms ever advanced against G. K. Chesterton is that he was oblivious of the miseries of men. A now forgotten writer in *The Bookman* more than thirty years ago wrote: 'He has amused and tickled thousands . . . but I cannot imagine that he has ever given one solitary individual a moist eye or a lump in the throat. Pathos and tragedy are notes, or rather, entire octaves, lacking from his keyboard. His boisterous optimism will not admit that there is anything to sorrow over in this best of all possible worlds. . . .' In answer to calumny such as that be it said that there is in Chesterton's work not only an awareness of human woe, but a depth of compassion for it, fully as great as dwelt in the soul of a Galsworthy or a Hardy. And it would be easy to cite a score of passages to justify that claim. But Chesterton's business with the whole huge misery of mankind is not to wring helpless hands and shed helpless tears over it, but to proclaim the secret of deliverance from it, and even in the midst of it.

We have ascribed Chesterton's strength, and sanity, and passion to the faith that was in him. One brief extract may serve to illustrate how large a grasp and piercing an insight characterized that faith. It is a feature of the Catholicism Chesterton espoused to emphasize the place of the Incarnation rather than of the Death of Christ, in that faith. In the main it may be said that Chesterton shares that emphasis. But a single sentence from his book *The Everlasting Man* reveals like a lightning flash his profound insight into the place the Cross takes in the Gospel. It occurs in the passage earlier referred to where Chesterton compares and contrasts the wandering life of our Lord with that of the great figures in philosophy and poetry.

Now, compared to these wanderers the life of Jesus went as swift and straight as a thunderbolt . . . it is a journey with a goal and an object, like Jason going to find the Golden Fleece, or Hercules the golden apples of the Hesperides. The gold that he was seeking was death.¹

To gauge the enormous significance of these words as an indication of where Chesterton stood in religious things, a useful measuring-rod is supplied by a passage from the pen of one who also claimed to be expounding the Christian Faith. Mr. Clutton-Brock was a literary critic of distinction, but when he essayed to instruct the world on religious matters, he could perpetrate the

¹ *The Everlasting Man*, p. 236. Published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

following: 'We cannot understand the Crucifixion unless we see it as a failure . . . part of the unintelligible waste of life.'¹

Yet even Chesterton was not without his blind spots. Luther was 'a great man who . . . had cried out in his sleep in a voice like thunder'.² Of the greatest religious leader of the last two centuries Chesterton might seem never to have heard — an impression rather confirmed than impaired by his employment of the gauche and wellnigh meaningless phrase 'Wesleyan religion'. Conceive the wrath of the little great man could he have known himself accused of starting a 'religion'. We know no 'Wesleyan religion' other than that Christian Faith which Chesterton himself, with an altered emphasis, professed. But indeed, not Dr. Johnson himself was more incorrigible where Dissenters were concerned than G. K. Chesterton.

IV

With some reference to the vexed question of Chesterton's prose style this somewhat chaotic notice may conclude.

Many are they who deplore the profusion of Chesterton's output. They would have had him, presumably, another Walter Pater, toiling and sweating over the turn of every phrase, the balance and finish of every paragraph, until his dozen or so volumes burn with that hard gemlike flame of which he himself has somewhere written. Well, a flame is a fine thing. And if gemlike, purged of every taint of smoke or impurity, so much the better. And for what we have received of flamelike splendour in the style of a Pater, the Lord (be it reverently said) make us truly thankful. But from so ungracious a temper as that which demurs at other gifts than these, the gift of a G. K. Chesterton for instance, the same Lord in His mercy deliver us.

Chesterton can on occasion command a prose style of strength and beauty to give it a place among the masters in this kind. A single instance must suffice. Here are the opening sentences of the essay entitled 'The Two Noises' earlier referred to:

'For three days and three nights the sea had charged England as Napoleon charged her at Waterloo. The phrase is instinctive, because away to the last grey line of the sea there was only the look of galloping squadrons, impetuous, but with a common purpose. The sea came on like cavalry, and when it touched the shore it opened the blazing eyes and deafening tongues of the artillery. I saw the worst assault at night on a seaside parade where the sea smote on the doors of England with the hammers of earthquake, and a white smoke went up into the black heavens. There one could thoroughly realize what an awful thing a wave really is. I talk like other people about the rushing swiftness of a wave. But the horrible thing about a wave is its hideous slowness. It lifts its load of water laboriously: in that style at once slow and slippery in which a Titan might lift a load of rock and then let it slip at last to be shattered into a shock of dust.'³

¹ *Studies in Christianity*, pp. 95-6. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Messrs. Constable & Co.

² *Short History of England*, p. 161. Published by Messrs. Chatto & Windus. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

³ *Tremendous Trifles*, p. 167. Published by Messrs. Methuen & Co. Reprinted by permission of the Executrix.

It may be freely acknowledged that much of his work is not of this quality. The fact is the body of Chesterton's work is a sort of enormous Christmas hamper. You thrust in your arms and draw forth now a pound of farm butter; now a fat capon; now great armfuls of rosy cheeked apples; now a bunch of muscatels. And if straw and dust be found as well, is the treasure the less a Christmas hamper on that account?

The lover of the Chestertonian hamper, plunging armdeep into those sixty odd volumes which bear his name, will find himself continually drawing forth fresh plunder. Some penetrating literary criticism; some illuminating paradox, some thunderous assault upon the walls of the City of Destruction; and always, and best of all, that fundamental faith in God and man that has made our author to be a strength and a tonic to so many whose feet were ready to fail.

F. H. LOWTHER

Notes and Discussions.

CHALMERS AND THE DISRUPTION

A HUNDRED years have passed since the Disruption of the Church of Scotland took place. The story of that event is written on one of the saddest and one of the brightest pages in the history of the modern church. There are few sadder happenings than the parting of friends, especially when the separation is brought about by differences of opinion over the deepest things. The rending of the body of Christ must ever be accompanied with tears. It should be noted that the Disruption was not a mere secession, though those who remained in possession of the property spoke of it as a secession. In the mind of Chalmers, and those who went out with him, it was the true Church of Scotland, renouncing its income and comfortable home in order to discover its true life. It would still have been a Disruption if it had been unanimous and if the whole Established Church had gone out into the wilderness. Nor was it a Disruption between Church and State, for Chalmers and his friends believed in the Establishment principle and never regarded themselves as in the same position as the separated Churches which approved the Voluntary conception of the Church. The State had its traditional associations with the Church, but it was not the ruler in spiritual concerns; it could not interfere with 'The Crown rights of the Redeemer'.

It will be seen that the cause of the Disruption was not quite so simple as appears at first sight. The right of the patron to appoint to a living (using the phraseology of the Church of England) may cut across the wishes of the parishioners. Even the Church of England begins to see that this system is in conflict with the New Testament doctrine of the Church as God's family circle. The Presbyterian saw this much more clearly. In Scotland there was a long history of spiritual independence. The call into the ministry came from the Church and not from the State or the heritor or patron. In the eighteenth century during the long Moderate ascendancy this was lost sight of. The General Assembly of 1834 passed a Veto Act by which, if the majority of 'male heads of families, being members of the congregation, and in full communion with the Church' should object to the minister named by the patron, the Presbytery should reject the presentee. From this point the controversy developed over special cases and was carried into the secular courts. The British Parliament

showed singular ineptitude in failing to grasp the seriousness of the argument. The rights of patronage were sustained in the sacred name of property against the privileges of the members and ministers of Christ's Church. State and General Assembly found themselves at cross purposes. No real attempt was made by Parliament to solve the problem and at the Assembly of 1843, on May 18, over 400 ministers walked out to form a new Assembly. The Disruption was the breaking away from State control in the spiritual realm.

The leader was the most distinguished minister in Scotland, Thomas Chalmers. Many of the chief leaders of the Church and practically all the missionaries in the Foreign Field went with him. They made the great sacrifice of giving up churches, manse, stipends and trusted themselves to Divine providence. The story of the Free Church of Scotland is heroic and inspiring, but now the separated elements are joined together again and the story of the Disruption can be told without bitterness. Dr. Hugh Watt in *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption* (Nelson, 12s. 6d.) has given us fuller detail than Dr. Henderson did in *Heritage*. He has also given us a picture of Chalmers as a social reformer, a great preacher and a vivid personality. When he died in 1847 even Thomas Carlyle said, 'I believe that there is not in Scotland, or all Europe, any such Christian priest left'. We can perhaps guess what Carlyle would have said of Newman, but an Englishman who meditates on these years is bound to remember that 1833 to 1843 were as much years of controversy in the Church of England as in the Church of Scotland. The secession of Newman to Rome took place in 1845; but he dates the beginning of the Oxford Movement from 1833. That movement also started with fear of the State's interference with the Church. Liberalism, the Reform Act, the Prime Minister's advice to the bishops that they should 'put their house in order', and the reduction of the number of Irish bishoprics, created alarm in the hearts both of Tories and of old-fashioned churchmen. To Newman and his associates these things challenged what the Scots called 'the Crown rights of the Redeemer'. Yet they too rejected the 'voluntary principle', for the first of the Oxford Tracts said: 'We know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State. Look at the Dissenters on all sides of you and you will see at once that their Ministers, depending simply upon the people, become the *creatures* of the people'. Chalmers had some harsh words to say about voluntarism and democracy in Church government, but he had a clearer and better vision of the true relation between a minister and his congregation than the men of Oriel College, Oxford, had. Some Methodists will think of another secession that took place about this time and will dare to place the great personality of Bunting beside those of Chalmers and Newman. It was Radicalism rather than Liberalism that Bunting feared. In those stormy years Bunting saw clearly that the Christian minister could not do his Master's work properly if he were merely the *creature* of the people. He therefore strengthened both the Ministry and the Conference to face the tempest. His policy was right if its administration was lacking at times in sympathy or imagination. In 1843 the sad mistakes of the 'split' lay six years ahead but there were signs of trouble. Over the Disruption, however, the Conference of 1843 unhesitatingly declared its adherence 'to what we consider to be by much the most important principle involved in the recent discussions — that it is the right of every Christian Church to claim in matters which are plainly and in their very nature spiritual and ecclesiastical, an unfettered freedom'. So in different communions strong currents raged.

A. W. HARRISON

CHRISTIANITY AND BOLSHEVISM

THERE seem to be people who know nothing about the French Revolution except what they learn from the films and *The Scarlet Pimpernel*. The result is that they sympathize with the aristocrats and know nothing of the agony of the common people for generations under the monarchy. Historians, on the other hand, know that the prolonged sufferings of the people were much vaster than the brief martyrdom of aristocrats, terrible though that was, and show that the French Revolution brought great benefits to the world, even though it was a 'god-less' revolution. Something of the same kind is true of the Russian Revolution. There is no doubt whatever that it began with horror, or that Stalin himself was implicated in the Russian 'terror'. In the Russian civil war England did what she could to help the Whites, and, when the Reds triumphed, a popular English newspaper led a 'stunt' to boycott Russian oil. The slogan 'No Russian oil sold here' was displayed before many an English garage. There was a general opinion that the Bolshevik regime could not last long. Meanwhile it was very difficult to get accurate information about Russia. Now all this is changed. After believing that 'no good thing can come out of Russia' some people seem now to believe that 'no bad thing can come out of Russia'. The horrors of the first years of the Revolution are, perhaps rightly, dismissed as inevitable. It is clear that Bolshevism, however modified, has 'come to stay'. Publishers tell us that all books about Russia pass rapidly out of print. Happily among them there are now a number of unbiased and reliable works. Of the many questions that ensue, not the least important is 'Is a godless revolution succeeding? What about Christianity and Bolshevism?' Some would rather say 'What about Christianity and Communism?' but the immediate problem concerns the particular kind of Communism that is being 'tried out' in Russia. Is Russia really god-less? It is impossible now to maintain that Bolshevism has just been thrust by a resolute and well-organized minority upon an altogether hostile majority. Has 'Holy Russia' perished with the 'little father', the Czar? It is easy to point to Stalin's recent compromises in the realm, for instance, of private property, but he has insisted in his speeches (and he has a rare gift of clear speech on complex subjects) that these compromises are temporary. He maintains that he is now practising 'socialism' and that this is only the half-way house to full Communism. Whether the compromises, on the other hand, have not 'come to stay' and will not multiply on his hands, need not now be discussed, for, in any case, the mighty Bolshevik structure remains, even under the strains of the war. What are Christians to say about the success, vast if incomplete, of this 'godless' experiment?

An answer is attempted in a small but valuable book entitled *A Christian Approach to Communism*, by Tiran Nersoyan.¹ The writer tells us nothing about himself except that he has some knowledge of the small Soviet Republic of Armenia. But his book shows that he is well acquainted with the authoritative literature of Bolshevism from Engels to Stalin, and he handles both philosophy and theology with ease. He calls his book a 'compact sketch', and both words are well chosen. It falls into two parts, the first dealing chiefly with the facts, and the 'second and main part' with a comparison between the Dialectical Materialism of Russia and Christian philosophy. In reading the book it is necessary to note what the writer means by some of his terms. For instance, by 'idealism' he means Hegelianism, and by 'dialectical' the approach to philosophy by studying the phenomena of experience and not from any pre-conceived dogmas. Again, it needs to be noted that the author accepts a 'monistic' account of Christianity, having no use, for instance, for Barthianism. In consequence he does not do justice to the Christian doctrine of sin, which he tends to reduce to a necessary element in the process of evolution. None the less his book has great merits, even though he perhaps pushes too far his account of the likenesses between Chris-

¹ Published by Fr  derick Muller at 3s. 6d.

tianity and Russian communism. He makes it plain that there are differences, though he believes that these are chiefly due to the fact that Leninists have not yet fully thought out the implications of their own theory. At the least the book is of value for its clear account of the reasoned ground on which Bolshevism bases, for it has a creed, as the writer shows, adding that 'Liberal States' have none. Who can deny that there is at least some truth in this charge?

It is only possible to refer in any detail to a few points in this clear but closely packed volume. In the first part we learn that 'Baptists in the U.S.S.R. have grown from insignificant numbers to five millions strong in the post-Revolution period'. Yet, of course, the orthodox Bolshevik belief still stands — that religion is unscientific, that it is the servant of capitalism, and that it is 'dope'. Has there not been much in Christian *practice*, not least in Russia, to justify this? The writer shows, again, that by the term 'class-less' Leninists do not mean that there are to be no occupational distinctions among men, but that no one class of men is to dominate the rest. Again, the claim is made that 'under the Communist system the personality of the individual is not submerged, but it is integrated into the greater life of a corporate society'. The recent story of Russia seems amply to support this finding. The writer is aware, of course, that the problem of reconciling the claims of society and the individual is perennial, and he does not claim that Russia has reached a perfect solution, but he adds that Christianity has not reached one either, and that Communism and Christianity are alike in seeking one, and in seeking one that shall do justice to the rights of the 'common man' — or, in Communist terms, the 'proletariat'. Yet it used to be taken for granted that for Bolshevism the individual was just a 'cog'!

In the second part of the book the writer begins by showing that Marxism, while it calls itself Dialectical Materialism, is not a *mechanistic* materialism. He claims that what it calls 'matter' should rightly be called 'reality' or 'being', that 'when Lenin says "Spirit, consciousness, the psychical, is secondary", he only means secondary in time', and that Marxism itself involves a doctrine of *values*. He goes on to argue that this, in turn, requires a belief in God. Indeed, his argument at this point is largely a development of the Archbishop of Canterbury's remark: 'If Materialism once becomes dialectical, it is doomed as Materialism; its own dialectics will transform it into Theism.' A Christian may believe this without accepting Mr. Nersoyan's own theological reconstruction in its entirety. His final claim is that 'Christian Philosophy does not refute Marxism, but being a more comprehensive world-outlook, includes Marxism in itself'. Of course he here means 'Marxism' when rid of its errors and imperfections, which, he holds, are not of its essence. For his own philosophy Mr. Nersoyan would use the name 'Dialectical Spiritualism'. It is rather a 'taking' phrase. At the least he has shown that Russian Communism, whatever it may say of itself, is not intrinsically atheistic, and that it may yet be reconciled with Christianity.

C. RYDER SMITH

REVIVAL IN GERMANY¹

THE longer the war lasts the clearer appear the issues. The old world order is partly in ruins and people all over the world are eagerly searching for a new one. There is a great difference in opinion as to the details, but there is unanimity in all quarters

¹ The author is a German-born engineer. He started his career as a carpenter in the Ruhr District, later studied Chemistry and Engineering and took a high degree in Chemical Engineering and Metallurgy. He is now engaged in the production of material vital for the war on behalf of the British Government.

Brought up on the lines of the State-controlled German Protestant Church, in 1933 he joined the Confessional Church in her fight against Nazism, but with his family had to flee Germany in 1938. He has been a member of the English Methodist Church since 1940.

that the new order must be based on the principles of Christianity if the peace to come is to be not just another twenty years' armistice, followed by another war. Peace will be concluded on the terms imposed by the victors on the defeated. These terms are 'unconditional surrender' and the conclusion of the Treaty is as sure as our victory, but whether such a peace will last ten, fifty or a hundred years, will certainly depend not only on the terms of the Treaty but on our life and thought. Such life and thought must be planned, and though many of the best brains of all denominations have, for the past two or three years, discussed the problems involved, in books and papers, from the Christian point of view, so far, with one single exception, there is no organized planning done to tackle this problem from a practical point of view. This exception is the post-war Relief Organization of the Society of Friends, but though based on the Christian principle of brotherhood of all men, they refrain from all evangelistic work and confine their help mainly to food, clothing and medical relief. There is no doubt about the blessing which such relief will bring to those who suffer, but the future peace and happiness of mankind will not, once the hunger is stilled, depend mainly on social circumstances.

A higher standard of living has never been a safeguard against lust for power and the will to fight for it. On the contrary, when we look through the book of history it seems that aggressiveness against neighbours tends to grow with wealth and that greediness in the political field which can never be satisfied. We shall be bitterly disappointed if we once again stake our hopes on material disarmament and on material assistance alone. What the world needs is a change of mind, a spiritual disarmament, a new fellowship of mankind. It is a revival of Christianity that the world needs.

The problem and the question on which success, and therefore the future, depends, is whether there will be an echo from the other side when the Christian Churches call out to those who are to-day our enemies.

Unfortunately there is no doubt but that the German Protestant Church of to-day and her most lively part, the so-called Confessional Church, are mere relics of the once strong fortress of European Protestantism. They comprise only a very small part of the German people, and when the war broke out their impact on the spiritual life of the nation as a whole was wellnigh insignificant. Probably not more than about one per cent of the Protestant population of Germany belonged to the Confessional Church. From reports received since, it appears possible that the figures may have increased, as Church life generally has the tendency to become more active in times of danger and of war. But on the whole it must be said that the Confessional Church has by no means such a hold on the German people as was sometimes assumed in this country. If it had, there would probably be no Hitler and no war. Moreover, it is of sad significance that now, when all over the world the Church strives to a new unity, there is nothing to be united in Germany. While through all the lands, Christian Churches of all denominations become conscious of their belonging together as limbs of one body, there are in Germany no living limbs, only one torso.

The Confessional Church, strengthened by the memory of her martyrs, will certainly be of invaluable help in the times of spiritual revival, but here influence will be limited, and through her we shall only reach a small part of the German people, just as we would not confine a Church Revival in England to the Plymouth Brethren, much though we may admire their sincerity and their faith.

The Church in Germany was based nearly entirely on the Lutheran tradition of subservience to the political authority in being. The lack of development, the lack of spiritual freedom, let us frankly say the lack of life, in this government-run and government-controlled Church, has petrified the ancient ties which bound a small part of the German people still to the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century, so

much that they became to the larger, and not always the worst, part of them unbearable shackles.

Whom then can we approach? Will there be any Germans willing to hear the call? I am sure there will. There are certainly many more Germans co-responsible for the horrors of this war than the small circle of leaders of the Nazi party, and there is no doubt that a great part, if not the majority, of the German people, followed Hitler's commands with, if not willingness, certainly with incomprehensible docility and obedience. But times of war are bound to give a one-sided and therefore distorted picture of our adversaries. However, when we try to lay the foundation of the future it is not for war, but for peace that we build. We have to see and consider both the best and the worst in our enemies of to-day.

We cannot, of course, blot out completely the last hundred years of German Church history, but we can try and show them the rich life, the mutual fructification and the blessing which has ensued from the free development of religious thought in Britain and the splendour with which each branch and each denomination has imbued our spiritual life. The German Church has for too long a time been a serf to the Government, and whoever could not comply with her exacting demands was lost for the Church of Christ. Incredible though it may sound, the German Church was firmly harnessed to the policy of the State, i.e. to a policy which for the last hundred years has been ruled by the maxim which Bismarck gave expression when he said: 'The great questions of the time will be decided not by speeches and resolutions of majorities but by blood and iron.' If we are determined to win the peace, we have first of all to find and help those Germans who like us are convinced that the great questions of the time will not be decided by blood and iron. English people, though themselves perhaps rather aloof in religious thinking, still believe in what I would call the three Christian virtues: Justice, Wisdom and Moderation. In other words, they believe in goodwill. The German father, the German mother and finally, as their product, the German child, believe in force — the whole attitude of the average German towards life can be traced back to this adoration of power.

Can this be changed? Certainly, though the present conflict surely has not emerged suddenly out of the blue, the gravest turn for the worse came with the rising tide of Nazism. But if Hitler succeeded, within barely ten years, in perverting ten generations of German youths by his evil influence, it is certainly possible to arouse the enthusiasm of the following ten generations for a good task and a life of service to their own people and to mankind. To deny this, is to show a lack of confidence not in the German people but in the transforming power of Christianity. If we despair at the possibility of our success it will not have been worth the sacrifices of this war.

Just a century ago German youth, particularly the students of German universities, strove to build up a Germany of freedom and justice, a Germany which was to be a free member in the family of European nations. The climax of their efforts was the election of the first German Parliament in 1848 — more than 500 years after the first Parliament met in England. It is not only the misfortune of Germany but the misfortune of Europe that this Parliament was a complete failure. Events proved that it was impossible to jump over the centuries and to cut short the development in the experience of other countries. Once again Germany fell back into the hands of her kings and princes, generals and landowners, but the spirit of freedom though subdued is still alive and will rise again when Hitler and what he stands for has been thrown into the abyss. There is strong evidence that even now under the iron rule of the Nazi regime, German youth begins to revolt against the rottenness of Hitlerism. It is very likely that the majority of these who when the day will come will overthrow the Nazi regime, and answer the call of reborn Christianity.

It will necessarily be Germans who will have to bring about a German revival, but exactly as the countries, which have been overrun and deprived of all essentials of living, will need our help to provide food and medicine, the disillusioned and spiritually exhausted people will need our help and guidance to build up a new fellowship in Jesus Christ. When the last war ended with the collapse of the Prusso-German monarchy, the State Church, though still intact, stood silently aside and, deprived of her backbone, did not realize her new opportunities. The German people, longing for spiritual guidance, were left to fill the halls where thought-readers, astrologers and fortune-tellers offered their cheap pseudo-religion. The Church, however, missed her chance. Just as we plan the feeding, clothing and healing of the liberated Central Europe, our spiritual help must be as carefully planned and prepared.

The political administration of Europe will probably again be in the hands of a League of Nations, though it may be different in name and in structure, but a carefully planned organization will be necessary to reinforce socially, psychologically and spiritually the political structure, and its main object will be the revival of true Christianity in Germany and other countries on the Continent. It will be the harbinger of the spirit of freedom, security, decency and justice, in which alone the future peace of the world can grow.

The first steps may not be easy. A people with their pride and conceit atrophied through generations will probably in the bitterness of defeat not be very anxious to listen to the advice and teaching of their enemies of yesterday — but did the Church ever shrink at difficulties like those? Have the missionaries ever asked whether they are welcome or not? Let us be equal to the task before us and once again let us be inspired by the life and vision of those who blazed the trail.

It is only the Church of Christ as a whole who can undertake this task and a united effort of all denominations will not only be desirable but necessary. Methodism as one of the greatest Protestant denominations must share in this task. The invaluable work done by the Ecumenical Movement in pre-war days, culminating in the formation of the World Council of Churches, has proved to what an extent co-operation is possible.

It was possible to build the former League of Nations from scratch within a very short time, so the prospects of building a new fellowship based on the living organizations of the Churches should be far better.

Some may say: To achieve this would be a miracle. Perhaps so; then let us perform one. Miracles do not come when we do nothing. If we want God to perform this miracle, He needs our arms, our energy, our faith. God is waiting for us.

EDUCATION IN EMPIRE

MR. F. B. MALIM, head master of Haileybury College from 1911 to 1921, and of Wellington College from 1921 to 1937, addressed a meeting of the Royal Empire Society on May 18, 1943, on 'Education in Empire', over which the Rt. Hon. R. A. Butler, M.P., President of the Board of Education, presided.

Some years ago [he said] an examination paper was set at Winchester College. It contained among other questions a familiar quotation from Macaulay, 'Every schoolboy knows who murdered Montezuma and who strangled Atahualpa, but we doubt whether one among ten of Englishmen of highly cultivated minds could say who won the battle of Buxar, who perpetrated the massacre of Patna, whether Holbar was a Hindoo or a Mussulman, and whether Surajah Dowlah reigned in Oude or in Travancore'. The paper went on, 'Justify the confidence expressed in the first part of this quotation and remove the doubt suggested in the second'. I

am not certain that after forty years of a schoolmaster's life I am prepared to suggest that there is anything that every schoolboy knows, but I am quite certain that very many persons of ordinary cultivation — not of course in this audience — would be a little hazy about the Terms of the Treaty of Waitangi, about the recommendations of the Durham Report, about the battle in which Isaac Brook lost his life, or the sequence of the remarkable Governorships of Sir George Grey. But the position is really worse than this. I do not believe that it is an exaggeration to say that the great mass of the people of this country do not know that the British Commonwealth is a League of Nations, autonomous and sovereign States, controlling not only their domestic concerns but their tariffs and their foreign policy. Too many still think in terms of colonies and British Possessions, and are genuinely surprised if they are told that Britain does not own Canada or Australia. They become credulous listeners to the German spokesmen, who accuse us of selfishly engrossing for ourselves a quarter of the globe, or to the numerous persons in this country who delight to give a sinister meaning to the words Empire and Imperialist.

But there is still more to be said. People not only do not know about the Empire, but they do not want to know. The Workers' Educational Association in their Report for the year 1941 published a list of their Classes held in the previous year. International Relation, claimed 549, General History 227, Political and Social Problems 133. Only 21 out of the whole list explicitly dealt with the Empire. The Secretary of the Cambridge Board of Extra-Mural Studies says bluntly that 'Imperial topics do not attract'. In 1938 the subject of their Summer Meeting was 'to survey in an objective manner the British Empire as it exists to-day', and the result was a very small attendance. Sir Samuel Turner has told us in his introduction to Mr. Ramsay Muir's pamphlet on the Empire that he had found in the United States a general belief that the Empire is founded on 'the successful pursuance of a policy of aggression', and that he has found in this country 'a distinct tendency to share this view and to be almost apologetic about the Empire'. So have I; so have we all, I imagine. The position may be summed up in three words: ignorance, indifference and prejudice. I admit that that is a little exaggerated, but I understand that this is a discussion meeting, and a certain amount of exaggeration may be provocative of discussion.

There is, however, enough substance in the allegation to arouse uneasiness in certain headmasters, all of whom have served for a time in one or other of the Dominions. They act together as a Sub-Committee of the Head Masters' Conference, and they have been allowed to co-opt me as a member of their body, although I am no longer a head master. After leaving Wellington I was asked to visit, on behalf of the Conference, the schools in the four Dominions which are members of that body; and, thanks to a generous grant from the Rhodes Trustees, I was enabled to make a journey which would otherwise have been quite beyond my means. I have no intention now of inflicting upon you any account of that tour; I mention it to explain how it came about that having certainly been ignorant of the Empire, though I trust neither indifferent towards it nor prejudiced against it, I returned with feelings akin to those of the Queen of Sheba when she asserted that the half had not been told her.

The Sub-Committee decided that they were concerned mainly with secondary schools, only indirectly with elementary or university teaching; and as I have used a term which may be misunderstood, I would explain that by a secondary school I mean one which provides the second stage of education, between the primary and university stages, and that the best-known secondary school in England is Eton College. One way — an imperfect way, but the only one available — of finding out what is taught in secondary schools is to ascertain in what branches of instruction they wish their pupils to be examined. We therefore made inquiries of the Eight Examining Bodies. To summarize the results of that inquiry I

will say briefly that no Examining Body requires its candidates to know anything of the Empire. Four of them set optional papers, of which the most successful attracted 600 out of 10,000 candidates. The conclusion to be drawn from this investigation is that the schools do not want their pupils examined in Empire History, because they do not teach it.

The Sub-Committee then turned to the schools. In reply to a series of questions, about 80 per cent of the head masters of the secondary schools of the country expressed themselves as in favour of the inclusion of questions on Empire History in the School Certificate Examination, and some 90 per cent would like to see an optional paper set in the Higher Certificate. But it is to be noted that they were almost unanimous in saying that such questions must not be compulsory, i.e. that a boy should not be required to answer such questions satisfactorily in order to secure a pass in History.

It is easy to make the objection that we are no further on, that boys still can pass through our schools without learning anything about the Empire. On that objection I would make two observations. The first is that we have at least suggested the need of Empire teaching, and that that need is being to some extent met. Not a few head masters wrote that in their sixth or other upper forms work was being done on the Empire, not necessarily for the purpose of examination. And thanks to the generosity of Sir Samuel Turner between 8000 and 9000 copies of Mr. Ramsay Muir's pamphlet, 'The British Empire, how it grew and how it works', have been circulated to all the schools of the Head Masters' Conference, and a large number of head masters, in acknowledging his gift, have expressed their intention of using the pamphlets for form work in some part of their school.

But there is a more important observation to be made. Head masters rightly refuse to be compelled to teach anything. They are, on the whole, reasonable men; and if you can convince them that a certain course of action is desirable they will generally endeavour to follow it, provided that it is found to be practicable. But if you try to compel them they become as obstinate as mules. There is always present to their minds the threat of bureaucratic interference, not generally from the Board of Education, whose Inspectors are men of wide experience and sympathies, eager to encourage experiment and initiative. The danger lies much more in the local Directors of Education and sometimes, as in the notorious example of Sheffield, in the local Education Authority.

It is necessary to turn out munitions by methods of mass production; it is cheap to turn out motor cars on those lines; but the last thing to which mass production should be applied is Education. Schools should be allowed freedom to develop. The most precious thing a school possesses, its personality, can never grow if its staff is appointed and its course of study dictated by external authority, a condition I found existing in some of the state schools of the Dominions. And therefore much as, for some reasons, I should like to see our schools compelled to teach Empire History, I should be false to a principle, for which I have contended in the past, if I were to urge that such a course should be adopted now.

The unwilling teacher is not likely to accomplish what we want him to accomplish, to kindle in his pupils an admiration for a great achievement and an enthusiasm for a great experiment. Some teachers are unable to do this, because their own admiration and enthusiasm have not been aroused at the University. It is always tempting to shift the blame on to other shoulders; but I believe it is true to say that Empire History would not be neglected in the schools if it were not neglected at the Universities. They do not provide us with the men who want to teach it.

Oxford has received from Mr. Rhodes the scholarships which in peace-time bring to her every year men from all the Dominions as well as from the United States of

America. From Alfred Beit she received a Professorship and a Lectureship in Colonial History, and in making this gift to the University he expressed his hope that British Colonial History should form an integral part of the teaching of Modern History at Oxford. Oxford accepted the endowment, but has not fulfilled the hope. From her students of History she requires no knowledge of the Empire. In the Modern History school one of three alternative papers requires the study of documents illustrating constitutional developments in the Empire. In 1939 this paper was attempted by 32 candidates out of 269. In order to obtain a first or second class it is necessary to offer one of eleven special subjects; two of these in 1939 dealt with the Empire. 13 and 9 — in all 22 — candidates chose one of these optional subjects. Even if you assume that the 32 candidates who offered the Constitutional paper were all different from the 22 who offered a special subject connected with the Empire, only 54 out of 269 professed students of History have cared to learn how the most remarkable institution in the modern world has come into existence. These are the men who come on to teach History in our schools.

Cambridge has less reason to apologize. Nearly sixty years ago Seeley delivered there the lectures which he afterwards published under the title of the Expansion of England. Forty years ago Alfred Marshall insisted that all candidates for the Economics Tripos must know something of Colonial History. The Master of St. John's is one of the editors of the Cambridge History of the British Empire. In and after 1943 one of the compulsory papers in Part I. of the History Tripos will deal with the Constitutional History of the Empire, and all the three groups of Colleges which hold scholarship examinations have agreed to include in their papers Imperial questions. This last is a matter of some importance. One head master, in answering our questions on Empire teaching, objected that it would be impossible to include the candidates for Scholarships, as they would have no chance of showing what they knew in the Scholarship Examinations. At Cambridge this is no longer true. The Faculty of History at Oxford has expressed its interest and undertaken to examine the question.

At the University of London the Rhodes Chair of Imperial History at King's College was occupied for many years by the late Professor Newton, whose recent death is a real disaster to Imperial Education. Thanks to his influence, questions on Empire History were included in the History papers for all Degree candidates. He was untiring in helping to organize the competition for prizes offered by this Society for Essays written on subjects connected with the Empire. But he was under no illusion that Essay Competitions or occasional lectures from eminent persons are any substitute for serious and continuous study. Not many weeks ago I heard him outlining a policy, the essence of which was to make the study of the Empire, its geography, its history, its constitution, its literature, its commerce, the solid core of our secondary education. If I understood him rightly, his contention was this: We had in days past an admirable instrument for education for those who were capable of rising to it, the study in their original tongues of the civilization of Greece and Rome, the origins of our politics, our art, our literature and our religion. To-day the claims of mathematics and the natural sciences on the time and energies of our pupils are so pressing that it is only a fortunate few who can still enjoy the privilege of a classical education. The remainder, instead of being nourished by the *literae humaniores*, are apt to be fed with scraps of information, and thanks to the dissipation of their energies on various subjects of study, never pursued with any thoroughness, are in danger of leaving school without ever learning what knowledge means. Here in the varied and magnificent story, that stretches from Francis Drake to Winston Churchill, you have a manageable and unified subject; it has a vivid narrative interest; it is the explanation of the modern world; and it embodies the gradual discovery and

development of the great ideas which have made the British Commonwealth of Nations.

That, or something like that, was the educational policy which Professor Newton was anxious to press upon the notice of the teachers of this country. I confess that I fear it will be a long time before so thoroughgoing a revolution can be effected in the programme of our schools. At any rate I would not be guilty of wasting your time by advocating a proposal which I only imperfectly understand. My point is this, that nothing short of regular and systematic study is likely to produce the knowledge of the Empire which we desire. I agree that the writing of an essay on some Imperial subject is excellent for the boy who has to produce it. He is obliged to read, to examine authorities for himself, to marshal his facts before he draws his conclusions. But even the excellent competition so long maintained by this Society touches only a very small percentage of the boys and girls in our schools. Unfortunately this is by no means the only body in this country which regards an Essay Competition as a valuable method of spreading the truth. A head master's daily batch of letters contains correspondence from a large variety of persons, who want, sometimes for the most excellent reasons, to be allowed to arouse the interest of his boys by offering them prizes, or circulating printed matter or delivering lectures. He has to spend much of his time warding off these onslaughts on their legitimate studies, their leisure or their pocket money. If anything really effective is to be done, it can only be by persuading head masters — and head mistresses who are sometimes even more awkward — that it is part of their duty to see that the British Commonwealth is rescued from the neglect into which it has been allowed to fall.

We have been endeavouring through the Ministry of Information and Professor Harlow to provide lecturers in the schools. There is in the country a number of men from the Dominions who are competent and willing to tell boys something, sometimes a good deal, about the Dominion from which they come. There has not been any great demand for the services of the lecturers, though one school asked whether a course of lectures could be provided. That was an encouraging sign. That there should be little demand for one lecture is not surprising. Such a single address can only do one thing, it can arouse interest; and if sufficient interest is aroused to make boys anxious to follow the subject and read it up for themselves, that is excellent. But do not be misled by the enthusiastic persons who manage to get invited to a school, who address it for an hour on some subject in which they happen to be interested, and come away convinced they have made a deep impression. Boys are generally courteous to strangers, especially if the lecture is given at a time when they would normally have been doing Latin Prose or quadratic equations. But let me assure you that there are very few boys who remember what they have been told only once. You cannot teach anything by an occasional lecture.

My own belief is that it is most important that the study of the Empire should become, as Mr. Beit hoped, an integral part of the teaching of Modern History at the Universities. My first reason is that only thus can we get the teachers we need in the schools. The second is this: I am not one of those who hold that politics, economics and philosophy are suitable instruments for the education of boys. For them we have the well-tried instruments of languages, mathematics and science. For the comprehension of the proposition that three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, or that subordinate clauses in Indirect Speech should in Latin be put into the subjunctive mood, no experience of life is necessary. But really to appreciate theories about the actions of men, about their behaviour as neighbours or as manufacturers, about the relation of the citizen to the State, and of one State to another, for this, as Aristotle told us, the young are unfit, for they have no experience of life and conduct. The undergraduate is a little better equipped than the schoolboy.

We all know that he is apt to be led away by one-sided and ill-balanced enthusiasms, but it is the special privilege of youth to see visions and to dream dreams. I would have the story of the Empire presented to them as the gradual, the still incomplete unfolding of a great vision; not as the acquisition of thousands of square miles, or the accumulation of millions of pounds worth of trade, or even as a record of endurance and courage. 'Magnanimity in politics', said Burke, 'is not seldom the truest wisdom, and a great Empire and little minds go ill together.' We ought to auspicate all our proceedings on America with the old warning of the Church, *sursum corda*. We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that Trust, to which the order of Providence has called us. We ought not to remain, as we so often do, apologetic; we should claim for this story that it is a great story, the story of a people who have been willing to learn by their mistakes, and, what is more, have been willing to repent of their sins. We are entitled to be proud that the people whose Parliament supported George III in the War with the American colonies, was willing seventy years later to accept and act upon the Durham Report. We may be proud that the people who welcomed the Treaty of Utrecht, because it gave them the Asiento, the coveted right of sharing in the profits of the Slave Trade, eighty years later were the first to outlaw that infamous traffic. We may be proud that the same people who produced the 'Nabobs' to disgrace our earliest administration of Bengal, has never for the last hundred years denied the truth that the end and aim of our rule in India must be the benefit of the Indian. The story I would have told is the story of how we have given the principles for which our fathers strove, the Reign of Law and the right of self-government to the United States and to the Dominions, and how we hope to give them to every Territory which is admitted to Dominion status. It is the story of a people which, though it may hold dominion over palm and pine, holds it only as a Trust, a Trust for the still undeveloped peoples who need guidance and help to take their places in the world, and a Trust for the kindly fruits of the earth, the cocoa of the Gold Coast, the rubber of Malaya, the copper of Rhodesia to be made available for the needs not of this island but of mankind. It would be absurd to suggest that selfishness and covetousness have not been present in the Empire. What human institution is free from human weakness? But the record is one of which as a whole we need not be ashamed, for in that record we may reckon with thankfulness not only the achievements of Wolfe and Clive and Rhodes, but also the influence of John Wesley and William Wilberforce and Edmund Burke.

MR. SEYS

A FOOTNOTE TO THE HISTORY OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY

In the Index to the second volume of the *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*, this entry appears: Seys, Mr., 171. On the page referred to we are told something of the beginnings of Methodist missionary work in St. Martin, a small island in the West Indies, which was then, as now, part French and part Dutch. 'A widow owning a large estate on the French side of the border happened to engage as manager a Wesleyan Local Preacher named Seys. With some difficulty Mr. Seys won his employer's consent to instruct the Negroes whose abandoned condition was deplorable. Through fear of oppression by the Government, hearing at the same time of Hodge's mission, Seys gave up the services he had commenced on his mistress's premises and obtained leave for the Negroes to attend the Methodist meetings held not far away on Dutch soil.' This is all the Society's *History* has to tell of Mr. Seys. Some inquiring readers may have wondered what happened to this Wesleyan

Local Preacher, this religiously minded young planter, who was concerned for the moral and spiritual welfare of the slaves under his control.

A chance discovery among some old family papers has, for one reader of the *History*, rescued Mr. Seys from oblivion, and placed him among those servants of the Kingdom who deserve to be remembered.

Jan Seijs, the great-grandfather of Mr. Seys, was born at Flushing in 1670, and was appointed to a post in the West Indies under the old Dutch West India Company. The Dutch Reformed Church has long ceased to work in St. Eustatius, but an entry in the old records states that 'Jan Ceis' was in charge of the Fort in 1728. Jan was twice married, and in 1726, by his second wife, had a son Jacobus. In 1781 Rodney visited St. Eustatius and sent an ultimatum to the Governor demanding immediate and unconditional surrender. The Governor wrote to Rodney:

Governor de Graaff, not having it in his power to make any defence against the British Forces which have visited this island of St. Eustatius, surrenders the same.

Johannes de Graaff
Jacobus Seijs.

The wealth in the island was enormous, and Rodney is said to have seized booty and stores to the value of three and a half million sterling. Jacobus Seijs, who signed the note along with de Graaff, was the son of Jan Seijs, born in 1726. Jacobus died ten years after Rodney's visit, a few years before his grandson, our Mr. Seys, was born.

The British Admiral ordered a list of burghers to be prepared and sent to him as soon as possible. On this list the names of all the residents of the island appear, together with interesting information about them.

Jacobus Seijs married, one son, one daughter,
 10 male slaves, 12 female slaves,
 3 boy slaves, 3 girl slaves.

The son, Jacobus Seijs, Junior, was only eighteen at the time, and had no property. Two years later this young man was married, and his wife was Catherine Runnels, sister of Governor Johannes Runnels. Readers of the *History* will be familiar with Dr. Coke's accounts of his encounters with the notorious Runnels, who did all in his power to stop missionary work in the islands over which he had control, and was so far successful that it was not until after his death in 1811 that work was able to start again in St. Eustatius. Runnels had given permission for 'Black Harry' to preach to the slaves, but revoked this permission the day before Dr. Coke reached the island on his first visit. Coke was permitted to preach before the officials, and all appeared well when he sailed for Carolina on February 10, 1787. Coke was back in St. Eustatius at the end of the following year, 1788, but found that Runnels had resold 'Black Harry' into slavery, and shipped him to North America. A proclamation had been issued which, as Dr. Coke said, was even against prayer.

'If any white person should be found praying with his brethren, for the first offence he should be fined fifty pieces of eight; for the second one hundred pieces; and for the third he should be whipped, his goods confiscated, and he should then be banished from the island. That if any coloured man should be found praying, for the first offence he should receive thirty-nine lashes; and for the second, if free, he should be whipped and banished; but if a slave be whipped every time.'

Coke was persuaded that nothing but power and opportunity were wanting to 'make Governor Runnels as cruel a persecutor as any one in the times of primitive Christianity'. In 1793 St. Eustatius returned a membership of 220, but persecution made any

kind of oversight impossible, especially as Runnels had threatened any persons who gave shelter to the missionaries, and the Island Circuit disappears from the list of 'Stations' for seventeen years. Runnels died in 1811, and the island belonged to Britain for a time, until restored to Holland at Vienna in 1815. When the old tyrant had breathed his last the unshepherded flock sent an urgent request to St. Kitts for a missionary to be appointed. St. Eustatius appeared on the 'Stations' again, and has remained there ever since.

It was Runnels' sister Catherine who married Jacobus Seijs in 1783. Three children were born to this happily married couple, but the parents must have died soon after the birth of their little daughter, Judith, for all three children were adopted by their aunt and uncle and brought up with their little cousins, as members of the same family. The three children were Jacobus, Jan, and Judith, and they were adopted by Pieter Heyliger Runnels, the Governor's brother, and his wife Judith Seijs, their father's sister.

Jan, who was born towards the end of the century, either in 1796 or 1799, was brought up by his uncle and aunt, Pieter and Judith Runnels, and is our Mr. Seys, the young planter of St. Martin. He had been born in St. Croix, where his father apparently held a post under the Danish Government.

Pieter Heyliger Runnels must have been a very different type of man from his brother the Governor, and wanted his own son to enter the ministry. Young Jan Seijs would have come under the influence of his more kindly disposed uncle in the home, and this no doubt turned his thoughts towards the Church when he grew older. In 1821 he became a member of the Methodist Church in St. Eustatius, where a cousin, a daughter of Governor Runnels, later became a respected leader. He was interested in the work of the mission, and notwithstanding the obstacles put in his way, the opposition of family and friends, and the memories of his uncle who had 'persecuted the Church', John became Superintendent of the Sunday School, a class leader, and in 1825 a Local Preacher. He had been known as an 'exhorter' for some years, so it was probably during this time that he worked in St. Martin. In 1829 he was ordained, and took the place of an English missionary who had died in Tortola, one of the British Virgin Islands. John Seys, the English form of his name, was the first white West Indian to enter our ministry.

His stay with us was brief, for during his year in Tortola his thoughts turned towards the United States, and at the end of 1829 he reached America, with credentials from the Chairman of the District, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and several other interested persons. He was soon accepted by the Methodist Episcopal Church, and appointed to a church in the State of New York.

If John Seys was touched by the moral and spiritual needs of the slaves in St. Martin and St. Eustatius, his passion for the souls of the coloured peoples remained with him throughout his life. The foundations of his life's work were laid in our little missions in two Dutch islands.

In 1834 the missionaries of the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Moravian missions in Liberia had either died of fever, or been forced to leave the country if they were to escape with their lives. Missionary work was at a standstill, and faced with the prospect of being abandoned. The Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church called upon John Seys to make one more attempt to plant the banner of Christ in Liberia. If he failed, the work would have to be abandoned. Seys sailed for Liberia in the same year, as superintendent of missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church in West Africa, and established his headquarters at Monrovia, just three years before Thomas Birch Freeman left England on a similar mission for the parent Society. In 1835 he returned to America for his family, and carried his wife and their three children back with him to Liberia. He revived the work, opened schools, and

established mission stations at all strategic points within his reach. For six years he laboured, and then in 1841 he and his wife had to return to the United States, shattered in health, and leaving four of their children buried in Africa.

For twelve months Dr. John Seys travelled throughout the States preaching and lecturing to raise funds for the mission, but in 1842 he was forced to abandon this, and seek quietness and an opportunity to recuperate his health, in a charge in Pennsylvania.

A year later the mission in Liberia was again without missionaries, and the Church turned to John Seys. Could he go again? Would he go again? His health had suffered, but the needs of the work were great. He responded to the call, and for two years was able to labour among his old friends in Monrovia, and at the out-stations. But two years were more than enough, and broken in health he had to accept charges in New York until 1850, still unable to face the rigours of the African climate.

But the interests of the coloured peoples were still, as always, in the forefront of his thought. The feelings born in St. Martin and St. Eustatius were still a constant challenge to him, and his ministry could never be exercised in its fullness far from his coloured friends. In 1850 he accepted an urgent invitation from the Maryland State Colonization Society to become their travelling agent, and served them in this capacity for six years. He then accepted a similar, though larger appointment, for the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. In 1856 his Church claimed his services again, and at the request of the Bishops he sailed for Liberia to select suitable sites for extended work away from the malarious coastal belt.

For the next fourteen years, 1856 to 1870, Seys was almost uninterruptedly connected with Liberia and the work there, his constitution having, apparently, overcome the results of his earlier residence on the Coast. He was United States Agent for Africans taken from captured slavers, and at one time had as many as four thousand of these unfortunate human beings under his care, all of whom had to be fed, clothed, and sheltered. He also acted as Consul for the United States, when the appointed officer died at his post. During 1866 he returned to America, and took charge of a church and coloured school at Nashville, Tennessee, but he had been there less than twelve months when a call came again for Liberia. This time it was the President who wished him to return, offering him the post of United States Consul and Minister Resident to the Republic of Liberia. His experience on the Coast and his acquaintance with conditions made him eminently suited for such a post, while the Government of Liberia looked on him as an old friend. He responded to the President's call, and filled his office with great acceptance to his own Government, and also to the satisfaction of the Liberian Government, who appreciated the presence of one who had the welfare of the country so much at heart.

In 1870 he crossed the Atlantic for the last time and, broken in health, though not in spirit, sought quiet and rest among his own folk. He passed away quietly in the early part of 1872, after some months of suffering. Those at his bedside heard him repeating portions of the 23rd Psalm as his noble spirit left its tired frame.

The Rev. Dr. John Seys returned once to St. Eustatius, very soon after he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. On this visit he officiated at the baptism of his little nephew, John Seys Hill, son of his sister Judith. The certificate, which is written in his own hand, reads:

JOHN SEYS HILL

St. Eustatius, June 4, 1832

I do hereby certify that John Seys the third son of Josiah and Judith Hill born on the 20th day of December, 1831 was this day Baptized by me according to the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America.

JOHN SEYS.

Ann Seys, John's wife, was one of the sponsors. John Seys Hill, the little boy referred to in the certificate, settled in British Guiana in 1848, and was the founder, and first head, of the British Guiana Mutual Fire Insurance Company, which was incorporated in 1880. In a little church at Anna Catherina, a village on the West Bank of the Demerara River, there is a memorial window to John Seys Hill, who died in 1909. This building is used now by the Methodist Mission to the East Indians.

Judith Seys had married Josiah Hill in St. Eustatius in 1825. The Hill family came originally from Norfolk, and reached the West Indies by way of Virginia and the Bermudas. In 1620 William Hill sailed for New England, and in 1629 his brother John followed him. It was the descendants of John Hill who later sought homes in the West Indies. The great-grandfather of William and John, William Hill, married Margaret Bilney, said to have been a niece of Dr. Bilney, who was burnt at the stake in Norwich in 1531.

It seems worth while adding this footnote to the story of Mr. Seys, the young planter and Local Preacher of St. Martin and St. Eustatius in the Dutch West Indies.

J. S. BOULTON

Editorial Comments

The Conference of the Methodist Church held in Birmingham last July will be remembered, amongst other things, for the dignity and grace with which the Editor of this Review presided over all its sessions, and the freshness with which he spoke at so many of the public meetings. His ceaseless activities throughout the coming year would have justified him in seeking release from all responsibility for the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*. But he has withstood the urgent request of his friends, and will be solely responsible for the contents of every one of the four numbers, with the exception of two features. He has handed over the entire care of the book reviews to his old colleague Dr. Ryder Smith. He has also called upon the present writer to take his place in supplying the Editorial Comments. The President's wish is a command in such matters. Old friendship is an even stronger motive. There is a third reason which forbids the writer to decline this duty. For ten years past this Review has borne the names of those who constitute an Advisory Council. This Council has seldom met in those years—never within the last five years. Whatever counsel has been offered has come by way of private correspondence. The Editor has a right to demand something more than nominal support. Dr. Church has generously allowed the present writer a perfectly free hand. He has imposed no restrictions. But the writer is obviously committing no one else to any views which he may express.

It may be well to recall the history of this periodical with its double pedigree. The *London Quarterly Review* goes back to the middle years of the last century. It was about 1839 that James Harrison Rigg, then a mere stripling of eighteen, wrote a letter to the *Watchman*, urging that, as other Churches had Reviews, Methodism needed one for the defence of its doctrines and its system. Ten years later, shortly before his ordination, Rigg wrote to his friend William Arthur, who was then assisting the Connexional Editor, to revive the project. The time was not yet ripe, but in 1853 the *London Quarterly Review* was launched. For many years under the joint editorship of Dr. William Burt Pope and Dr. Rigg it held on its way, surpassed by none of its contemporaries in that class of periodical. After the lamentable

breakdown in Dr. Pope's health Dr. Rigg carried on the editorship until the Review was taken over by the Methodist Publishing House. During all these years the articles and the reviews were unsigned, but many of the best scholars in Methodism were contributors, and an article on William Blake written by James Smetham won from D. G. Rossetti the judgment that it was the best and most penetrative review of the artist's life and character that had appeared. The range was never narrow, for not only biblical literature and theology, but philosophy, history, literature, and science claimed a place. Nor were students of Methodist history ignored, for to this day no saner history of the constitutional development of Methodism is to be found than a series of articles contributed by Dr. John S. Simon. Unfortunately the series was never completed. Mr. Hugh Price Hughes brought influence to bear upon the committee of management to prevent their continuation for fear that this scholarly record, if carried to the middle of the century, might retard the cause of Methodist Union!

When the *L.Q.R.* (as it was popularly styled) became the property of the Book Room in 1898 Dr. W. L. Watkinson, as Connexional Editor, added this to his other duties. The change was marked by a more attractive outward form and by affixing the names of writers to all articles. Reviews were still anonymous. After one year in the Editorial chair Dr. W. T. Davison, who succeeded W. L. Watkinson, returned to tutorial work, but continued as the most regular and distinguished contributor. Indeed his essays in the *L.Q.R.* for some forty years were unrivalled in their range of subjects and in their literary charm. John Telford conducted the Review from 1905 until his retirement in 1934. Two striking features during Mr. Telford's long reign were the regular inclusion of an article by some theologian of note outside the Methodist fold, and the Editor's own contribution, into which he compressed with consummate skill the substance of the most recent biography.

The *Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review* owed its success to the splendid loyalty of the ministers and the more cultured laymen of that Church, and to the contributions of its most famous scholar. I first came to know it well when that most hospitable of editors, the Rev. H. B. Kendall, was in control. I remember him with gratitude for in one year he accepted two articles of mine, more than thirty years ago! About 1910, the name had been changed to the *Holborn Review*. After the death of that distinguished editor, John Day Thompson, in 1919 a critical situation arose. The Review was the property of the Primitive Methodist Preachers' Friendly Society, and financially it was in low water. An appeal was made to Professor A. S. Peake to become editor. Perhaps of all the great sacrifices which he made for his Church none was greater than his consent to bear this load. Already overburdened with work, with important literary schemes clamouring for attention, he set about this fresh task with characteristic energy. He felt that his Church had done nobly to maintain such a Review for more than half a century. He knew that if he was to secure notable contributions from scholars outside the denomination he could not offer them the small remuneration which his own fellow-members in their loyalty were content to receive. He wrote to his friends among the laymen of his Church and raised a fund which enabled him to enlist the help of a brilliant team of contributors. Apart from Dr. Peake's own inimitable causeries, the well-planned pages of reviews, and some admirable articles by colleagues and younger Primitive Methodist ministers, the subscriber knew that every number of the Review would contain one article by a writer of renown outside the denomination. It was thus that Professor Gilbert Murray's Henry Sidgwick Lecture appeared in an issue of which 1800 copies were printed and sold. This, indeed, was abnormal, but with the first number that appeared under Dr. Peake's direction the circulation rose with a bound to nearly

1000, whilst the third and fourth reached a sale of well over 1400. The two factors in this success were the high reputation of the Editor in the theological world, and the loyalty with which the ministers rallied to the aid of the Friendly Society whose fortunes were bound up with the prosperity of this Review. Yet at the end of 1927 Dr. Peake was again compelled to send out an appeal to the ministers to become subscribers themselves and to use their influence to extend its sale amongst the laity of the Church. The circulation was too small for any profit to be made, and for some time the balance had been on the wrong side. Without a vigorous and widespread effort to increase the circulation it might be necessary to suspend publication. Much of Dr. Peake's best strength during the last ten years of his life was lavished on the *Holborn Review*. With his death in 1929 the circulation rapidly dwindled. When Methodist Union came in 1932 the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* carried on the double tradition.

It says much for the enterprise of the Methodist Publishing House that this Review is still published when we consider how many have been the war-time casualties in the publishing world. Shortage of paper, high costs of production, reduced staff, difficulties of distribution, all might excuse a policy of caution and retrenchment. But there are moral as well as financial factors to be taken into account. When Dr. Peake faced a grim situation in 1927 he refused to lower the flag, although he confessed that release from the editorship would be a great relief to him, since it would set him free for other urgent work. But, he added, 'the relief would be dearly purchased at such a cost. The magazine performs a valuable service, partly through its articles, partly through its reviews of books. It contributes greatly to our denominational prestige'. I do not know what the present quarterly circulation of the *L.Q. & H.R.* is, but I know that it has never since Union been proportionate to the number of ministers in the Church. Its influence is felt far beyond the limits of the denomination. It is taken in and read in Public Libraries and in Universities and Theological Colleges throughout the English-speaking world. But its circulation might be increased enormously if the Editor could secure the loyal co-operation of all the ministers of the Methodist Church.

Do ministers read as many biblical and theological books as they did a generation ago? Generalizations are always precarious, and it might be answered that robust readers were always a minority. There are some indications that solid reading is not in high favour to-day. Many spend time in listening to wireless talks rather than in reading. Others are content to deliver themselves up to some Book Club, to have their monthly choice of a half-crown book made for them. News-letters and popular booklets provide ready-made material for the pulpit in a day when topical talks have largely superseded the expository sermon. It is much easier to interest a congregation by a light psychological lecturette or by a discussion of some political or economic question than by setting forth the contents of the Christian gospel. And yet the man who has wrestled with the great truths of the Biblical revelation can gain a hearing and hold a congregation if the sermon has vitality. But this does mean that the preacher should be always toiling in his study that he may not be afraid to handle the great themes. A few shelves of 'Penguins' and 'Pelicans' do not make a minister's working library.

The most serious indication of a decline in interest in the kind of books which furnish the minister's mind is to be found in the religious press. Let anyone whose memory can carry him back forty or fifty years compare the space given to book reviews in such leading papers as the *British Weekly*, the *Methodist Recorder*, the *Guar-*

dian, or the *Church Times*, with the number of columns formerly devoted to the latest theological literature. The peculiar restrictions imposed by war rule out the last four years from the comparison. Who can forget those admirable and full-length reviews which Marcus Dods, James Denney, James Moffatt, and other such giants once wrote in the *British Weekly*? To some of us they were an introduction to the study of Theology. For some years past few books have received more than a brief notice amid comments upon a jumble of miscellaneous works. In the period between the wars the *Methodist Recorder* has steadily diminished its allowance of space to reviewers, and those masterly surveys which such scholars as Drs. Davison, Tasker and Loft-house used to give of the best and most recent books are scarcely known to later generations of readers. Now the significant fact is this. These weekly religious newspapers are edited by shrewd men who know what they are about in catering for their own readers. It must be presumed that they know what they are doing. In times of peace paper is not scarce nor dear. No parsimony is shown in purveying humorous paragraphs and domestic prattle. If the axe is laid at the root of the tree of knowledge it is because the taste for that kind of fruit has been lost.

I said that generalizations are dangerous. If a note of pessimism is heard in the last two paragraphs it is still possible for cheerfulness to break through. There is evidence of a keen interest in theology even in these days. We may rejoice that so brilliant a mind as that of Mr. C. S. Lewis has turned to theology, even while recognizing the peril that besets the amateur theologian. No competent student would put *The Problem of Pain* in the same class as Dr. Wheeler Robinson's *Suffering, Human and Divine*. But the fresh and untechnical approach of the convert from agnosticism will gain a hearing that would not so readily be given to a scholar who has spent a lifetime wrestling with the problem in all its parts. A tract by Miss Dorothy Sayers will prove a best seller, in the first place because she has mastered the craft of popular writing, but also because she has come herself to see that the problems of life are ultimately the questions which only Theology can answer. After all religion concerns the man in the street, the girl on the golf-course, the woman in the bus, as well as those who are to be found in the pew. One of our great needs is an army of laymen well equipped to discuss religion with those who are vaguely interested in it, but have yet to be convinced that it deserves and demands earnest thought. Some of the best writing that has been published in the last quarter of a century has been of this character. There is an increasing demand for the middleman who can translate the thought of the study into the idiom of the street. The B.B.C. evidently places a high value also on the expert who can make himself understood. For after all the intelligent listener recognizes the tone of authority in the man who knows, and he generally misses it in the facile echo of another man's views.

The great need is that the expert should (to borrow a phrase from a well-known modern translation of the New Testament) 'have a sense of what is vital in religion'. Two series of books are in this way representative of our time. Between the two wars the firm of Nisbet leapt to the front with the Library of Constructive Theology. Under the joint editorship of Dr. Wheeler Robinson and the present Dean of St. Paul's there has been a steady output of books by highly qualified theologians. The two basic principles on which these books rest are the need of 'a candid, courageous and well-informed effort to think out anew, in the light of modern knowledge, the foundation affirmations of our common Christianity', and 'the value and validity of religious experience'. If the success of this series proves that Theology is very much alive to-day, we may take the Moffatt New Testament Commentary as a gauge of the interest which is still taken in Biblical exposition. It may be said that there is a danger

that the careful study of the Greek text is yielding to an indolent contentment with an English version. The danger for ministers is undeniably there. But on the other hand such a series of commentaries opens the treasures of the most scholarly exegesis to the Greekless, and in its best volumes, those, for example, by Dr. C. H. Dodd and Dr. James Moffatt, sends the serious student back to the original text. Here again the emphasis is upon the living message. 'Everything ought to be subordinated to the aim of elucidating the religious content, of showing how the faith was held in such and such a way by the first Christians, and of making clear what that faith was and is.' The bearing of this upon preaching is evident. It is also related to another subject which is supremely important, that of religious education.

There is no doubt that at the present time the Bible is a closed book to a large majority of the population of this country. A vague interest in religion, though not in the Christian Church, is accompanied by an abysmal ignorance of the essence of Christianity. It is generally recognized that some religious basis is needed for an education for life. Unfortunately the acrimonious discussions to which the Education Bills of 1896 and 1902 gave rise, and the failure of every bill brought forward by successive Presidents of the Board of Education after the great Liberal victory of 1906, have made religion in the schools too thorny a subject for any rising politician to handle. But with the new age that confronts us at the close of the war old shibboleths must be dropped and sectarian warfare come to an end. The warm welcome given to Mr. Butler's White Paper is a hopeful augury. There are still problems that await solution, as the fine debate in the Upper House (and not least Lord Rochester's admirable speech) made abundantly clear. The single-school area presents the chief rock of offence. The National Union of Teachers quite naturally watches with suspicion anything that even looks like imposing directly or indirectly any religious test. The 'right of entry' is widely resented. Much will depend upon the clarity, cogency and persuasiveness with which the Free Church point of view is presented when the Education Bill comes before the House of Commons. Meanwhile we have every reason to be thankful that the Minister upon whom the chief responsibility rests is concerned above all else for the interests of the child, and that he recognizes so clearly that religion is a supremely important factor in education.

Confining ourselves to the positive benefits to be seized in the new opportunity, three aspects of the question call for attention. First, the use of the Bible in religious instruction. This was once a battlefield for 'irreconcilable convictions' held tenaciously by sectarian opponents. The day of the 'agreed syllabus' has largely disposed of this bogey. Secondly, the teacher himself. It is rightly said that no one ought to teach a subject which he is incompetent to take, and that only an enthusiast can create enthusiasm. The remedy is partly in the hands of the Training Colleges, where steps should be taken to provide the most competent and inspiring training for those who wish to take this subject. But the Church has an even greater part to play. In the very forefront of its appeal for Christian service it should emphasize the high vocation of the Christian teacher who qualifies not only to take other subjects in the curriculum but also secures a qualification in religious education, so as to volunteer for this honourable but sometimes unpopular service. Again, in the many schemes which are being organized up and down the country to provide lectures in biblical studies, ministers who have made good use of the opportunities which their College training has given them and have a qualification in Divinity which will command respect, should lose no chance of offering their services in so far as their pastoral duties will allow. The third aspect of the situation is the place of Worship in the school. Atmosphere counts for more than syllabus. The personality of the teacher of religion is

important. School prayers may leave the deepest mark on the character of a child. Reverence and the sense of reality make a lasting impression. In this connexion the relation between the life of the Church and the education of the child is all important. In the discussion in the House of Lords to which reference has already been made both the Archbishop of York and Lord Quickswood laid stress upon the vital part which fellowship plays in all religious culture. In many of our churches the standard of worship must be raised, that those who have been taught that in religion the good, the true and the beautiful meet us, may find themselves responding to the threefold appeal in the sanctuary. Still more must the place of worship be more fully recognized in our Sunday Schools. Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs of our time is that both in theory and in practice Worship is coming into a new prominence in the life and teaching of the Church.

WILBERT F. HOWARD

Ministers in Council

War time throws up many problems in philosophy, politics, religion and ethics. Fraternal and study circles can be of real helpfulness in seeking to relate these to central Christian principles. Below are given some samples of questions that are being raised.

* * * * *

SEARCHING FOR LIGHT. Now in its third edition, *The Midnight Hour* by 'Nicodemus' (Faber) continues to attract attention by its confessions and impressions. The author had been at Oxford in the first decade of the century with a view to ordination. But there he lost his hold on traditional Christianity. The experiences and disenchantments of the war of 1914-18 sapped and submerged his faith. Gradually and arduously he has in later years been finding the clue to firm belief in Christ. Though he had also come to the conception of the Church as the essential matrix of a real Christianity, he would seem to have had considerable misgivings as to the ability of the Church of England to fulfil his ideals. Marshalling arguments as to its merits and demerits he had however decided, on the balance, to offer himself for the ministry of the Anglican church. Ultimately the authorities intimated their unreadiness to proceed with his ordination, apparently because views on the church unacceptable to them had been expressed by him in an article in *The Christian News Letter*. The article had been unsigned but the identity of the writer had become known. Disappointed at the refusal, 'Nicodemus' elected to go on with the work of a Lay Reader under a sympathetic vicar. Then he published this story of his spiritual pilgrimage. Here is much matter for analysis and thought where ministers foregather.

* * * * *

DAYBREAK IN THE COUNTRY. At a time when the way seemed to be opening for his ordination, and the only questions would be as to his location, 'Nicodemus' expressed himself in his journal as wholeheartedly desirous of rendering service in the country. He believed that under rural conditions there might come a blending of the poet and the priest. As he puts it, 'There at least the priest is for the most part free from the mechanism of modern collectivism: there he fathers a real community and the seasons of the Church and of Nature are at one. Then in a simple ministry among simple folk and elemental and sacramental facts, the poet may lift his sacrifice upon the wings of song'. He was convinced that it was the country parson's life to which he was called and he added: 'I believe it is now the seed plot of the regeneration of Chris-

tianity, Christianity came from the soil and must return to the soil for renaissance. Such a pronouncement is symptomatic of the considerable interest which is being awakened in religious life and work in the countryside. This too calls for serious thought.

* * * * *

CHAPELS AND CHAPELRIES IN CORNISH VILLAGES. The *Church Times*, on September 3, called attention to the fact that on the previous Sunday Cornish Methodists had commemorated the 200th anniversary of the first visit of John Wesley to the Duchy. Thereupon it went on to say how curious it was that in the rural parishes of Cornwall the parish churches are frequently situated at considerable distances from the centres of population. No reason is suggested in explanation, nor is even a guess hazarded. Can any reader of this column throw light on the subject?

The writer of the article referred to, however, next remarked that most parishes included several hamlets in addition to the principal village. In these hamlets, presumably, the Anglicans had no place of worship.

But, said the *Church Times*, there can be no doubt that much of the Methodist success in Cornwall was achieved by the custom of building chapels in nearly every village and hamlet throughout the county. This would also seem to be an acknowledgment of the wisdom of the policy pursued by Methodists in the past of erecting a place of worship amongst the landworkers themselves and not merely in close proximity to a manor house or the hall of the squire.

As a final comment the writer pointed out that when Benson became the first bishop of Truro he set forward the ideal of a church chapelry in every hamlet throughout the diocese, and although this ideal was only partially realized there are about a hundred of such chapelries in the diocese.

One might append the query whether all denominations have not in the past been too prone to let their policies of evangelization and programmes of edification revolve too exclusively around a consideration of numbers. The churches have been more or less ready to put down their places of worship where crowds are found and to give of their best in personnel to the multitudes. Must not every new Forward Movement recognize afresh the sacred obligation of the church for the finest spiritual service amongst the villages of our day? Must not this also involve the provision of buildings in rural areas for the service of youth in the Christian spirit on weekdays?

* * * * *

COUNTRY-BORN PESSIMISM. Lest it should be supposed that life in or near the land is idyllic, there comes to hand a salutary reminder that contact with Nature, especially in childhood, may have sinister effects for a lifetime, on character and outlook. Lord David Cecil last year gave a series of talks on Thomas Hardy as Clark Lectures at Cambridge by invitation of the Master and Fellows of Trinity College. These he has now published under the title of *Hardy the Novelist* (Constable, 7s. 6d.). Passing his early years in the Dorset village of Bockhampton, Hardy was profoundly influenced and moulded for all time by what he there saw and felt. It was not only that economic conditions were bad. 'In clay-built cramped cottages men struggled year after year against wind and weather to support a wife and family on 7s. a week.' The life of the Wessex labourer was life in the raw. But to him Nature seemed cruel and indifferent. In the woods of Hintock apparent peace masks an unending struggle for survival. 'Even a love scene in the pastoral idyll of *Under the Greenwood Tree* is jarred by the anguished scream of a bird caught by an owl.' What was portrayed of Nature in his novels he had himself witnessed. 'As a little boy he even hated seeing the boughs lopped off from the trees. The first time he saw a dead bird he was struck by an appalling unforgettable chill of horror. By the time he was fifteen a shadow had fallen across his vision of life.'

There were also other factors in village life besides this interpretation of Nature which may tend to explain how it was that Hardy by the age of 27 had lost his faith in the Christian verities — and did not feel it a dead loss. These contributing circumstances Lord David Cecil vividly describes in his discriminating study.

The modern cry of 'Back to the Land' must not therefore blind us to the possibility and indeed probability that some sensitive, thoughtful souls will not, unaided, turn from Nature to Nature's God. The Creator must be seen through the face of the Saviour Christ if he is to be reliably known as Father and if his handiwork around us is to be a mirror of divine goodness and not the breeding ground of human scepticism.

* * * * *

JONES OF BOURNEMOUTH: NO SECTARIANISM IN THE SCHOOLS! At the Independent Press has been published *J. D. Jones of Bournemouth*, by Arthur Porritt. Though lacking the sparkle of Dr. Jones's own volume of reminiscences, *Three Score Years and Ten*, yet here is supplied a useful and complete survey of the crowded life of a sturdy and unashamed Nonconformist.

It is interesting to find Mr. Porritt citing Dr. Jones's continued protest against the injustices suffered by Free Churchmen in the educational world. In these pages is told how he fought the Balfour Education Act in 1902. Nearly thirty years later, when addressing the Congregational Union Assembly in 1928 he reiterated his dissatisfaction with the situation. He said: 'At the bottom of all this clamour and strife lies what is known as the "religious difficulty"'. If what our denominational friends want is *religious* teaching, teaching that shall instruct the children in the Christian facts and Christian principles, we are ready to meet them. We are as keen on a Christian England as they are. In many counties and towns, syllabuses of religious teaching have been agreed upon by representatives of the various churches. No one can dismiss them as being thin or inadequate. They are genuinely and deeply Christian. Upon the kind of religious teaching represented by such syllabuses we are prepared to agree. But if it is *sectarian* teaching they want then with Cromwell we say, we "scruple to feed that humour"'.
 And, adds his biographer, 'On that firm ground he stood adamant to the end'.

* * * * *

HOW TO PRESENT MORAL RESPONSIBILITY. A thought-provoking booklet of some sixty pages is *Man: the Forgotten*, by F. J. Sheed. Published in London by Sheed & Ward (1s.) it bears the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York and appears to owe its inception in part at any rate to reflection on a speech by the President of the United States, for the writer comments: 'When Mr. Roosevelt uttered his slogan "The Forgotten Man", something throbbed in the whole nation to show that he had touched a nerve; there was the sudden realization that a whole host of unprivileged men had been overlooked'; but to Mr. Sheed the phrase proved capable of meaning something far deeper: it was a summons to a radical examination of the essential nature of man. His contention is, Ask what is man and Hitlerism is condemned. Settle what is man and you make the family secure and the State more stable. Decide what is man and you have firm sanction for morality, an understanding so badly needed in these days of laxity.

The argument is set out in popular fashion. Thus, dealing with the Moral Law, he reminds us that a motor driver is subject to two sets of laws. First there are the police regulations, as for instance that he must not drive without a licence, that he must not drive past red lights, that he must not exceed certain speed limits. But there is a second set of laws that also affect his use of the car. These are the instructions issued by the maker of the car. He must see that he has water in the radiator; certain parts at given times must be oiled and greased; he must not drive too fast when the car is new and he is running it in. Now the Moral Law is not to be thought of so

much as police regulations (Mr. Sheed thinks, not at all), but rather as Maker's Instructions, because God is our Maker. He best knows what will yield beneficial results and what on the other hand will mar His creation.

The author proceeds to apply the consequences of this in up-to-date fashion to specific problems of individual, national and international life. At given points Protestants may prefer to state certain problems and answers in a different way but most readers will agree that here is a modern setting worthy of careful thought.

* * * * *

SMETHAM'S SQUARES. In reply to the question raised in these columns last quarter as to the whereabouts of Smetham's Squares, I am much indebted to the Rev. W. H. Beales, M.A., the Warden of the Deaconess Institute, Ilkley, for information which looks as if it may serve as a clue. If that proves to be so, it may be possible later to give some interesting news.

W. E. FARNDALE

Recent Literature

Documents of the Christian Church, selected and edited by Henry Bettenson. (Oxford, 3s.)

In this addition to *The World's Classics* the student will find a very useful selection from the chief 'authorities' for the history of the Church from the First Century to the Twentieth. Documents not in English are translated. Here are Creeds and Councils, 'Rules' and Confessions. Here, too, are Tacitus and Tertullian, Athanasius and Arius, Charlemagne and Innocent III, Francis and Aquinas, Wycliffe and Luther, Henry VIII and George Fox, Toland and Newman, and so on. In a disarming Prefatory Note the editor refers to the difficulty of making a satisfactory choice for so small a volume as this, but on the whole he has chosen admirably. Any serious student of Church history will now be able at least to begin to carry out the frequent piece of advice, 'Go back to the original authorities'. The volume is also interesting in secondary ways. For instance, it appears that Wycliffe's opponents said that in his doctrine of 'dominion', which is so up to date now, he taught 'that God ought to obey the devil! Or again, Luther wrote that 'We (Germans) were born to be masters! Henry VIII claimed that the 'realm of England' was an 'empire' (in the sense of his day); the Lollards confused the Latin words for 'heart' and 'hart'; James I forbade people 'of the meaner sort' to play bowls. It is interesting, too, to compare the literary styles of different periods and documents. But, of course, the chief use of the volume — to quote the 'jacket' — is to provide 'the hard facts of many disputed questions, the ammunition for controversy, the corrective to loose thinking and idle speech'. In recommending it the only caveat needed is the warning that the 'book is compiled from an Anglican standpoint' — and a 'High' one at that. A Free Churchman could easily criticize the section named 'Dissent in England' both for what it includes, what it omits, and the nature of some of the editorial notes. For instance, extracts from Methodist documents are gathered under 'The Organization of the Wesleysans', and we get — not quotations, say, from the *Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion*, or from Wesley's sermons on the *Witness of the Spirit* — but from the *Deed of Declaration*, the *Plan of Pacification*, and the *Model Deed* of 1832. The moon is not more important than the sun.

The Fourth Freedom. By L. E. Cooke, G. Phillips, and J. M. Phillips. (Independent Press, 3s.)

Church Membership. By L. J. Tizard. (Independent Press, 6d.)

Hitherto little has been heard of the Congregationalists who oppose the present scheme for the re-union of the English Churches (apart from Rome), but in the first of these books the old colours are 'nailed to the mast'. The writers are all *alumni* of the Lancashire Independent College, and there is a foreword by its Principal, Dr. Grieve, with a letter of Dr. Selbie's as postscript. The first of the three writers deals with the witness of Congregationalism in the past, the second with detailed objection to the proposed scheme, and the third with the need for individual liberty, especially liberty of thought, in the present world situation. Through all three discussions, however, there runs a protest against authoritarianism in Church organization, the 'enemy' being the Anglican Church. The claim is everywhere made that the historic Congregationalist principles are far from out of date. The writers are very outspoken, as indeed, with their convictions, they ought to be. One or two of their objections would perhaps lie against a union confined to Free Churches. Comparatively little is said about the autonomy of the local church, but much against the 'imposition' of any kind of determinate creed — unless it be 'I believe in the New Testament and in the right of every Christian to interpret it for himself'. Many Unitarians, however, would accept such a creed, and perhaps the three writers would be willing at least to add, with the author of the second book, 'I believe in the God who was in Christ'. The problem of creed is a complex one. The Methodist Church does its best to meet it by adopting a broad credal statement of evangelical content, leaving room for the living Church to interpret it (or re-interpret it) under the guidance of the Spirit, but not 'imposing' it on the individual member. How far would these 'extreme' Congregationalists agree to such a method? The second book shows that Congregationalists and Methodists go all the way together about Church Membership. One could wish that Mr. Tizard had been a Methodist, for, if 'Methodist' were read for 'Congregationalist' (with one or two other consequent changes) here we should have just such a statement about Church Membership as many of us desire. This is an excellent booklet.

Reflections on History. By Jakob Burckhardt. (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.)

It is now allowed that Burckhardt of Basle was one of the masters of history. This translation of his chief work is very timely, for he lectured about 1870, when, as he saw, the epoch began in which we still live. An Introductory Note tells us that he used to walk into his class-room, take his stand in front of his desk, and, without preliminary or note, begin to talk. In his mature period he refused to publish anything, and this book reads like 'headings' for lectures rather than lectures themselves. This accounts for their almost aphoristic form. They show a very rare combination of range of learning, depth of insight, and brilliance of style. There are a hundred sentences that would take a page to develop, and more still that give the reader 'furiously to think'. The lectures illustrate many times the powers of apt illustration and of irony named in the foreword. The irony is subtler than Gibbon's. Often, too, there is a challenge to current judgments of history. This is a book that consistently stimulates the mind.

The main subject is the inter-relation and inter-action of three of the chief elements in history — the State, religion, and culture. By the last Burckhardt meant 'the sum total of those mental developments which take place spontaneously and lay no claim to universal or compulsive authority'. Under the first negative culture contrasts with religion and under the second with the State. Whereas religion and the State tend to be 'static', culture is constantly changing, and it is the perpetual critic of both. It

includes language, the arts, education, commerce, and everything else that goes to make a distinctive way of life. It is clearly Burckhardt's favourite element; on the other hand, he dislikes the State, for its *differentia* is the use of force and for him force is a necessary evil. Having described each of the three elements, with many an incisive comment, he goes on to describe the fate of each of the three when it is 'determined' by one of the others. Three further subjects are then examined in the light of the main discussion. The first of these is 'The Crises of History', with special reference to 'the (still) present crisis'. Here there is no attempt to systematize crisis, but a series of penetrating notes on its varying phenomena. Perhaps it is here that the writer's irony reaches its zenith. The second supplementary subject is 'Great Men', and it is the best examination of this difficult theme that I have read. The final chapter is an arraignment of the idea that happiness is the chief end of man. Burckhardt holds that it is unlikely that men have ever been happy, or ever will be, but that unhappiness, even to the point of agony, has often (though not always) been a spur to progress. He claims, similarly, that peace may be as harmful as war.

Only a few further comments can here be made on this wealthy book. Burckhardt points to the Hohenstaufen Frederick II as the first representative of the line of modern would-be world-dictators. He assigns the perfecting of their practice to Louis XIV, implying that Napoleon and Peter the Great also belong to the succession. The virus of dictatorship, therefore, is no monopoly of Prussia. Again, how does this historian treat England? Rather scurvily, an Englishman may think. Burckhardt, who refused to follow Ranke at Berlin, seems to have held that freedom is the monopoly of small nations (such, no doubt, as Switzerland), and that it is incompatible with empires, if only because of their size. Even in his time were not the British Empire and the United States making not unsuccessful attempts to combine the two? In a final survey of the crisis that he saw beginning in his own day he declares that, if only a man could take a detached standpoint, he would wonder to see 'the spirit of man' as it 'soars above' all calamities to 'build its new house'. In some ways Burckhardt seems to be a pessimist, but what of this?

The Soviet Caucasus. By David Tutaeff. (Harrap, 8s. 6d.)

Corsica produced Napoleon — and the Caucasus produced Stalin. For this reason alone the latter country would be of interest. Again, while the French Revolution began in horror, its later results have been good; is this to be so also with the Russian Revolution? This book, which describes the *second* phase of Bolshevism in a selected area, suggests that it will.

The book gives a brief but graphic account of the geography and history of the Caucasus. It is a medley of mountains and valleys, a medley of climates, a medley of races, and a medley of religions. There are some four hundred languages and dialects! In a remote valley there is a negro village! There was a Georgian kingdom for a thousand years. From Alexander to the Czars invasions have swept up its passes and through the gap beside the Caspian; it is a land of ancient refugees.

Most of the book, however, tells of the state of the country to-day. There are many statistics, yet the writer, who is a native of the Caucasus but who writes English like an Englishman, has a lighter touch too. For many centuries the Caucasus had been a forlorn and derelict land. Yet the great valley between the two mighty mountain ranges is naturally a kind of earthly paradise. Both its mineral and agricultural wealth is phenomenal. Yet the multitudes of 'barons' who infested it for ages did little but quarrel, and when the Russians came, they did little but conquer. No one thought of the 'common man'. It becomes plain, as one reads the book, that the cult of the proletariat, whatever its faults, bases on the love of just this 'common man'. Bolshevism is formally and deliberately god-less, but what is the ultimate source of

this love? The book deals with a land that is unlike the rest of Russia in almost every way — yet it shows, too, in miniature, what the way of the Bolshevik is. It seems plain that to-day the U.S.S.R. has gone far in the solution of several pressing problems — the problem of minorities, the problem of the equality of the sexes, the problem of collective agriculture, and the problem of far-sighted and far-reaching planning. This is still true even if a heavy discount were put on the claims of the book. To give two samples of its interesting detail — experiments are being made in the production of nicotine-less tobacco, and a green cotton is being grown.

What Does Gandhi Want? By T. A. Raman. (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.)

After the Tambaram Conference three of the Chinese delegates journeyed to Wardha to ask Gandhi for guidance. Does this mean that they thought that he might give them something that they had not got at Tambaram? At any rate it shows how many people, from all parts of the world, turn to the Mahatma for advice. Mr. Raman, who is a personal friend of Gandhi but not a pacifist now, tells this story. He rightly insists that to know Gandhi's mind we must turn to his own words, and this small book consists largely of quotations from Gandhi's organ, *Harijan*. I am one of those who differ from Gandhi at every crucial point in the controversy between pacifist and non-pacifist, but, as I read this book, I found myself saying 'Is he not consistent after all?' His fundamental principle, of course, is 'non-violence', but the word that he uses for it, *satyagraha*, is not a negative word, and he believes that pacifism, at least in international affairs, is a positive principle, and the only principle that will end war. Like Christians he 'looks for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness'. This means that, whether he knows it or not, East and West mingle in his mind — for the typical Hindu answer to the world's joys and woes is 'All this is illusion; keep away from it'. For Gandhi *satyagraha* is far more important than the independence of India, but he demands the latter, for he believes that, perhaps after a civil war, a 'free' India would become a democracy (a Western idea surely!), and might lead the world on the one way to peace. His only hope of the practice of his principle in the near future *requires* the independence of his country. His tool to secure independence is non-cooperation — yet for him this is not itself a fundamental principle, but a tool. Like all tools, it may be used sometimes in one way and sometimes in another — or it may simply lie idle. So Gandhi may advocate mass disobedience at one time, the refusal of taxes at another, and the preaching of non-violence by a few selected advocates at a third. It is in his relation to Britain that he comes nearest inconsistency. When she was the victim of German air-invasion his 'sympathies' were with her, and at first he promised to do nothing to 'embarrass' England's war effort, even though he thinks it wrong to resist invasion by force. Yet he vetoed the Cripps proposals, and then claimed the right to preach *satyagraha*, for under the former India would have pledged herself to fight. The inconsistency seems to be verbal rather than real. Yet no man could be allowed to negotiate with Japan (even though it were to propose non-violence), or to seek to persuade Indians not to enlist. The Indian Government could do nothing less with Gandhi than what it did. But is he inconsistent? It is wise to understand an 'enemy', and this book will help readers to understand Gandhi, though sometimes the writer seems hardly to see all the implications of his quotations. The book also shows that pacifists, like non-pacifists, may have to commit themselves to terrible courses.

The Gobi Desert. By Mildred Cable. (Hodder & Stoughton, 21s.)

This book is a *parergon*. The writer and her two companions, after spending many years among the crowds of China proper, set themselves to spread the Scriptures in the wastes of the Gobi. To do this they needed eight versions of the Bible — including

English (a mystery that is left unsolved). The mighty Gobi, apart from one wandering Scottish missionary, seems to be an area that the overseas work of Christianity has not yet reached. These three women traversed its huge expanse five times. This took them years, for they wandered into many a side-path. In the end they were able to leave the Desert, having 'finished the work' that they had set themselves to do. And now Miss Cable has written one of the very best of travel-books. This is no superficial sketch of a hasty journey. Already the world that she saw has begun to pass away, for Russia has brought the motor-car and the aeroplane and the telephone and the typewriter into the waste spaces in her effort to help the Chinese against the Japanese. This is likely to be a 'source book' for all future writers about a great slice of the world. In a generation of great women explorers these three take a foremost place. This *paregon* is a kind of masterpiece.

Perhaps the chief impression is of the encroaching and pervasive sand. Next to this comes the sense of 'the road', for through many centuries now the Gobi has been a place to cross. There is evidence of the *camaraderie* of the 'road', for it is almost inevitable that those who run the same daily and dire risks should make the habit of sharing the lore of the journey. Yet the divisions and enmities of the many races that frequent the Gobi are even clearer — Mongol and Tungan, Chinaman and Turki and Russian, and what-not. Indeed, it becomes plain as one reads that only the three women themselves were 'friends of all and enemies of none'. Their chief helps here were a universal sympathy, their medical skill, and their sheer helplessness in face of physical force. But there is much more than the sand and the road. Miss Cable has an eye for *flora* and *fauna* and stones and lakes and mountains, as well as for everything in human life, from ascetics to the victims of a kind of 'tick' that creeps up the body to the nape of the neck, painlessly burrows under the skin and sucks the blood. Here there are stories of paradises set in the Desert, of life in a bandit camp, of the sad fate of the last ruler of the kin of Zenghiz Khan, of deserted cities of the fertile past, and so on and so on. With all this there is 'atmosphere' — a thing that no one can attain by trying, but that just 'comes of itself' to a chosen few. Miss Cable has the secret here, for she writes out of a heart that 'loves much' (which is the primary need), and knows how to write with insight and simplicity (which is also a *sine qua non*). There are multitudes of details that one would like to quote, but one must suffice — the women of the West to-day, as they abandon skirts, are unaware following civilized men in the imitation of the Tatars. This is a book of the rich harvest of unassuming heroism.

They were Great Americans, by twenty-eight writers. (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

This is not an ordinary book, and it must be judged by its purpose. To borrow the Gettysburg prepositions, it was written *of Americans, by Americans*, and, in the first instance, *for Americans*, under the title *There were Giants in the Land*. It was published at the suggestion of the Treasury Department at Washington, as a piece of propaganda for the Home Front. Unlike much propaganda it tells the truth. Twenty-eight living Americans write of twenty-eight giants of the past. All but one or two of the articles are well written. Lee is one of the exceptions, but Lincoln is very well done. Both the selection of the 'giants' and the order (or disorder) of the articles would justify the word 'miscellany', were it not that one motive runs throughout. The writers all share an enthusiasm for the American Ideal, and every article illustrates it in action. Some of the giants are unknown to most Englishmen. Who, for example, was 'The Swamp Fox'? Or, who was Carl Shurz? (a question answered by a writer called Wendell Willkie). There is one woman, one negro, and (rightly) one Frenchman. A Baptist preacher, a Roman Cardinal, and a free-thinker 'lie down together'. There are vivid stories — for instance, of two famous duels. There

are interesting details — for instance, that a nephew of Wesley's carved a bust of Tom Paine, and that when a young Roman priest named James Gibbons was trying to gather his scattered flock in the Carolinas, he was offered and accepted the use of a Methodist Chapel. It would be easy to ask questions — for instance, whether Cleveland and Bryan could both be right about currency. But it is a very good thing that the book has been written and that it is now offered to English readers. Nations, like individuals, ought sometimes to see others *at their best*. Here is a cross section of American life at its noblest. The book is well illustrated.

The Land of the Great Image. By Maurice Collis. (Faber & Faber, 16s.)

The 'land' of the title is Aracan, but Aracan in the days of its glory in the seventeenth century. The main theme is the adventures of Sebastião Manrique, an Augustinian friar, but Mr. Collis puts these in the context of the Portuguese empire in Asia, with not a few justifiable and 'thrilling' divagations. There is much about the rotting splendour of 'Goa the Golden' and the horrors of Eastern Bengal at the time. The writer is not always accurate in his European facts (was Loyola 'essentially ecstatic?'), and his occasional explanations and observations have no great value, but, as readers of Mr. Collis's other books will expect, his descriptions are his strength. His book has atmosphere, or, to use his own word, the very 'feel' of the times. He has read widely in out-of-the-way books, and spent twenty years in the lands he describes. The stories that he tells are often 'stranger than fiction' — for instance those of a terrible drug called *datura*; of a lady who carried off a toe of the dead Xavier in her mouth; of the pounding to powder of a supposed tooth of the Buddha, 'worth a million'; and of a band of houghed Portuguese captives in the mountains of Aracan. Yet there is glamour as well as horror. When he has read the book, a Christian will reflect that three hundred years ago Hinduism, Buddhism and Catholicism alike cried aloud for the 'pure Gospel word'.

That Day Alone. By Pierre van Paassen. (Michael Joseph, 17s. 6d.)

The writer is a journalist of Dutch extraction but brought up in Canada. He has lived for about twenty years in France, and has visited many countries and seen many outstanding men. Here he gives us a series of stories that embody as many 'studies' of the world-situation. He begins with his experiences in the days when France was occupied. Then there are two chapters about his birthplace, the little town of Gorkum in Holland, before and after the German attack. Then he gives us a number of pictures from various countries, chiefly but not wholly European, illustrating the impact of the Nazi and Fascist terrorism upon the life of 'the common man'. Next he describes certain 'Irrevocable Hours' in the march of events from the last war to this one — centring in Hitler, Clemenceau, Maurras, Tanaka, and so on. Finally he adds his own account of the course of history and the future of the world. The book, especially in the earlier part, bases on his own experiences, and even where he has supplied details, there is no challenging of the main facts. Mr. van Paassen disclaims the merely 'objective' style, but he nonetheless paints pictures of 'things as they are'. The reader should be warned that in the main this is a book of horrors — but ought we not to face 'things as they are'? Of the author's skill as a writer there is no doubt, nor of his eye for detail, nor of the effective restraint of his language. In the true sense of the word, this is a 'fascinating' book. One can hardly stop staring at it, harrowing though it is. Throughout the writer has in mind 'the poor and him that hath no helper'. For him the root of the world's troubles is the control of capital by a selfish few. Who shall deny that at least this is *one* of their main causes? There is criticism of the Churches, particularly of the Roman Church, but, while Mr. van Paassen is not 'orthodox', he is fundamentally Christian, for he has the Bible in his

very bones. When he selects three 'righteous men' for whose sake God will yet 'spare' mankind, they are all Ministers of Christ. And, while he is agnostic about the world beyond, he looks for the Kingdom of God in this world. 'Watchmen, what of the night?' 'The night is dark . . . is dark . . . is dark . . . — but the day breaks!'

Britain's Future Population. By R. F. Harrod. (Oxford, 6d.)

To its fine series of *Pamphlets on World Affairs* the Oxford Press is adding a series on *Home Affairs*. In this one Miss Harrod gives clear answers to several questions. Is it true that if things remain as they are, Britain will lose a quarter of its population every thirty years? The answer is 'yes'. Here the author shows that the best guide is by no means the birthrate, but the average number of *girls* born to each woman. Will this decrease mean disaster? Again, 'yes'. Here we learn that a *decrease* in population may lead to an *increase* in unemployment! What are the causes of the decrease? We don't know, though some likely guesses may be made. What is the cure? Miss Harrod says, in effect: 'Do parents the justice to increase their income to meet the costs of a family.' This, of course, means 'family allowances', such as Sir William Beveridge suggests, but Miss Harrod would add a compulsory insurance scheme for people whose income is over £250 a year. The scheme would be self-supporting, and the contributors would draw from the fund sums proportionate to the number of their children. This plan pre-supposes that it is desirable that those who have the advantages of a better type of home, should not die out. This is a good introductory pamphlet on an urgent subject. There is, however, one question to which the author pays quite insufficient attention: Is not the real remedy a change of heart? It is here that the duty of the Church falls. It should teach that it is the privilege and duty of Christian parents to train and send out Christians to serve mankind. It should teach, too, that almost every woman 'lives *her own* life' best through motherhood, and almost every man through fatherhood. (It is interesting to note that Miss Harrod seems to assume that no woman is a 'spinster' by choice!)

One Fight More, by Alan Thornhill (Muller, 2s. 6d.) might have been called 'Streeter and the Oxford Group'. The writer is himself a 'groupier' and a 'don', as well as a close friend of Streeter. A book to stir the heart of any Christian. *One Church*, by the Bishop of Lichfield (S.C.M., 9d.), is 'an appeal to the ordinary Christian'. In it he will find brief, clear and adequate answers to three questions: 'What is the case for Reunion?' 'What is the position now?', and 'What ought I myself to do?' In *Lessons of My Life* (Hutchinson, 9s. 6d.) Lord Vansittart, replying to his critics, gives his *own* account of 'Vansittartism'. Its strength lies in its serried phalanxies of *facts*. Mr. J. A. G. Bruce is a master at Rugby, who knows the right kind of food for the mind. His *Wisdom of Men* (Faber, 5s.) is a well-arranged anthology 'for youth', in which he gathers characteristic passages on such subjects as manhood, freedom, nature and religion, from many writers, chiefly English, but ranging from Thucydides to to-day. Dr. John Baillie's very fine address at the close of the General Assembly has been printed under the not very apt title *The Prospects of Spiritual Renewal* (Blackwood, 1s.). Starting from Chalmers, he diagnoses the malady of to-day, finding it to be rootlessness, both social and spiritual, rather than paganism. To its lives of William Carey and Andrew Fuller, the Carey Press has added a very well-written life of *Robert Hall*, the great Christian orator, by Graham W. Hughes (2s. 6d.). In *Can Methodism be Destroyed?* (Epworth Press, 1s. 3d.) Mr. H. G. Tunncliffe, like Mr. C. S. Lewis, has waylaid the devil's postman; the style of the letters he has filched shows that there is another clever demon besides Screwtape! In Mr. Leslie Davison's twenty-two poignant *Ballads of Bermondsey* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.) the splendour of the Christ mingles with the very smell of the slums.

God and the World, Essays in Christian Theism. By J. Scott Lidgett. (Epworth Press, 6s.)

Dr. Scott Lidgett has collected into a handy volume seventeen essays which have appeared in the last ten years or so in the *Contemporary Review*. Often his method is to use some recent book as the starting-point for the discussion of some subject of permanent interest. Brief as the essays are, they show a wide acquaintance with the argument of the books themselves and the literature of their subjects. How, in the face of all the public and ecclesiastical duties which no weight of years allows him to dream of relinquishing, Dr. Lidgett can keep himself and his readers so strikingly *au courant* with the latest developments of theistic speculation, can only be surmised. He moves from Dr. Hallett on Spinoza to Karl Barth on Reason and Revelation, from Professor Whitehead on Process and Reality to Sir Charles Sherrington on Man as 'the lonely apex of Evolution', like a specialist on each of the subjects. Indeed, Dr. Lidgett's comment on Archbishop Temple's Gifford Lectures might with equal fitness be applied to this work—'It is all the more remarkable as coming from one who is charged with the unceasing tasks and cares of high ecclesiastical office'.

But how can such ponderous themes be treated in a few pages? Do they not need the spaciousness of the essays of Macaulay? It is true that Dr. Lidgett relies to a large extent on his readers' intelligence, as he has always done, from the appearance of his first work on the Atonement onwards. He expects the reader to be willing to re-read a sentence or paragraph in order to make sure of his closely-packed thought. Often what might have occupied a chapter is crowded into some half-dozen reflections or observations, numbered with the precision of a text-book. Nor does Dr. Lidgett confine himself to reviews. For about a third of the essays he chooses a theme rather than a book, with a resulting freedom which the reader will certainly appreciate. Even after all his years of thought, Dr. Lidgett is still, on at least one subject, feeling for a final expression of it; there are here at least three views on evil, that obstinate Apollyon of the Christian apologist; yet the three move steadily towards unity. More weight is perhaps laid on the argument from the three Values (familiar to students of Dr. Inge) than it can well bear, but the centre of the circle will be found in the second essay, 'The Phenomenal and Reality'. Dr. Lidgett is no more a Thomist than he is a Barthian; and his dedication of his book to Dr. Pope will remind all to whom that great teacher is still more than a name, that the God whose 'voice rolls the stars along' speaks also in 'the promises'.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

The Unity of the New Testament. By Archibald M. Hunter. (S.C.M., 5s.)

Preface to Bible-study. By Alan Richardson. (S.C.M., 5s.)

The New Testament has too long been regarded as a dome of many-coloured glass, and we are now beginning to see the white radiance of the one true light which shines through its every part. Dr. Hunter's book is a valuable contribution to this subject. Taking 'the story of salvation' (Heilsgeschichte) as the theme of the New Testament, he develops his subject under three heads: One Lord, One Church, One Salvation—and demonstrates the basic agreement of the Synoptics, Acts, St. Paul, St. John, Hebrews and 1 Peter. Much that was formerly regarded as Pauline is now seen to belong to the original Kerygma of primitive Christianity; and on a still wider scale the fundamental harmony of the apostles' teaching with that of their Master is indicated. It is maintained, for example, that Jesus' conception of His Messiahship implied the creation of a new community. Christ's saving work is described as 'sacrificial', in agreement with Dr. Vincent Taylor. While the writer does not ignore diversities of presentation in the New Testament, his book is a suggestive exposition of the 'united front' of the Christian faith.

While pleading for loyal acceptance of scholars' findings, Canon Richardson's timely book is not concerned with these but with the Christian believer's attitude to the Bible as a whole and the spirit in which he should approach it. The writer shows that the alternative to Fundamentalism is not necessarily a 'Bible designed to be read as literature'. Other writings may be inspired and of great value but the Bible is the one book in which we can be sure of finding the voice of God, for in it we encounter His final word in Jesus Christ. The uniqueness of the Bible springs from the uniqueness of Christ and from the redeeming deeds of God in Israel's history which prepared for His coming. The Scriptures are not a record of man's growing experience of God or of a normative religious experience, but 'a book of witness, not of argument'. Incidentally, it is pointed out that a high doctrine of the preached word follows from 'the real presence of Christ in the sermon'. There are useful discussions of 'the new divine language' and the Christian exegesis of the Old Testament, as well as practical suggestions for study groups.

T. F. GLASSON

The Inner Shrine. By Gilbert Thomas. (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.)

The Spirit of the Great Silence. By Arthur Wood. (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.)

Pilgrims in Vanity Fair. By Crete Gray. (Epworth Press, 6d.)

The Touch of Jesus, God chooses the Altar. By W. A. Chettle. (Epworth Press, 3d. each.)

All that Gilbert Thomas writes is fresh and distinctive. Here he strikes the deeper and graver note. Poems of this order are wrought out of life's perplexities by struggle, insight and faith. The many who are trying to find some way of reconciling the actual with that which we feel ought to be, will find in Mr. Thomas one who has emerged from the contradictions and confusions of human life into the solemn beauty of the Inner Shrine. Arthur Wood's work is an allegorical prose poem, charmingly phrased. 'Where is thy God — why is God silent and heedless of our cry?' is the subject. By suggestion and illustration an atmosphere is created in which the silence is itself the very effective answer. Crete Gray presents leaders of study-groups with a booklet on the First Epistle of Peter that will be of considerable help. The points of contact with modern life are surprisingly relevant and unforced. The list of 'Questions' opens up interesting issues, and many will find the Epistle afresh by way of this booklet. Effective devotional addresses may be built on the lines indicated in the small booklets by the late W. A. Chettle.

E. B.

The New Order in the Church. By William Adams Brown. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, \$1.50.)

Dr. W. Adams Brown will probably be remembered by many as the American author of a handbook of theology that was really attractive and never dull. But he has for many years taken a leading part in inter-denominational Christian work; and more recently he has served as chairman of the American sections of the 'Life and Work' and 'Faith and Order' movements. In this valuable little book he sets down his mature thought and ripe conclusions on the subject of the effort for worldwide church unity associated with Lausanne and Edinburgh. The argument in general is that in the post-war world divided churches will be helpless churches; that the world's primary needs, such as a unifying faith and economic sharing, can only be supplied by a rightly ordered church; and hence that the right ordering of the church is something that we dare not postpone. Dr. Brown claims that we need common worship, common service and a new education, and that, as unhappily 'those who are ready to take the forward steps that are needed are comparatively few', there must be a new leader, for a true leader would find no lack of followers. The book should

have contained a more careful discussion of the meaning of a world-church, or church universal. Is it an amalgam of the different churches now jostling one another on the religious platform, or is it the whole number of men and women, in every country and every walk in life, whether organized into communities or not, who believe on Jesus the Son of God as their Saviour and Master?

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

What Is the Church Doing? By Henry P. Van Dusen. (S.C.M., 5s.)

This is a book that every Christian should read and re-read. Men often demand evidence for the relevance of the Church to our present national and international problems. Here it is given by incontrovertible facts. The range of evidence is wide, embracing the whole world, but Dr. Van Dusen is concerned primarily with its three most important parts — the steadfastness and increasing power of the Churches in oppressed countries, the unexpected strength of the younger Churches, and the growth of the oecumenical movement. A study of this book should deliver English Christians from their too prevalent pessimism, and restore their faith that the Spirit of God is shaping a new order out of the chaos of our times.

R. K.

Three Centuries of American Hymnody. By Henry Wilder Foote. (Harvard University Press; Milford, 22s. 6d.)

This scholarly and opulent book is important, not only to the serious student of hymnology, but also as a lively contribution to the history of Protestant Christianity. It is historical in the best sense, avoiding over-scientific treatment on the one hand and mere homiletic anecdote on the other. Amid the mass of names, sects and publications the 'great stream of religious thought and practice' (to quote the Preface) is clearly traced all the way from the Reformation inheritance of the Pilgrims down to the less securely based idealisms of our own times. The story opens with the American counterpart of Sternhold and Hopkins, the famous (Massachusetts) *Bay Psalm-book* dating, like Harvard University, from 1636, and closes with the twentieth-century reaction from denominationalism and the present trend towards an undogmatic 'application of religion to life'. A long and fascinating story, yet how recent, after all, is the modern hymn! We have hardly had time to decide whether its primary function is liturgic or homiletical. The best part of the book is the chapters describing the slow change from psalmody to hymnody, a change accomplished not without persistent and recurring controversies between champions of old and new, both in words and in music. Was the 'man-made hymn' really 'thrusting the Holy Ghost out of the Church', as William Romaine averred in 1775? In America as in England, Isaac Watts helped largely to give the answer. The influence of the Wesleys was very much less. Music receives due emphasis throughout. Besides giving many interesting facts about the introduction of organs and the changing standards of congregational singing, the writer is particularly concerned to refute what he calls the 'vulgar superstition' that the Puritans hated music. The defence here has already been convincingly argued by Dr. Percy Scholes, to whom the author acknowledges his debt.

To many English Christians the words 'American Hymnody' probably suggest Mission choruses, and to some Unitarianism. Both are here faithfully dealt with and set in proper perspective. The camp-meeting and revivalist hymns of the nineteenth century are shown to originate from earlier 'folk-hymns', of which some curious examples are given. The author compares them aptly with the debased sentimental element in Catholicism. Unitarian influence is associated from the first with Harvard and the literary 'New England Renaissance'. The writer's judgment of the great

Unitarian hymn-writers, and of Whittier who ranks with them, is sympathetic and soundly based. He gives an objective account of both conservative and modernist trends; and although, in pointing the contrasts of three centuries, a certain bias appears in favour of the undogmatic type of hymn illustrated, *par excellence*, by the *Pilgrim Hymnal* of 1931, his description of this collection as 'markedly undogmatic, non-ecclesiastical and humanitarian in tone' is not apparently intended to commend it. Appendices are added on the practice of 'lining out' the metrical psalms and on a typical eighteenth-century controversy over musical methods.

A. S. GREGORY

The Art of the Missionary. By Ronald O. Hall, Bishop of Hong Kong and South China. (S.C.M., 2s.)

Nowadays it is not uncommon for a missionary to be accused of deserting his own country in a time of great spiritual need. But the accusation is chiefly made by those whose vision is limited to a general desire for human happiness; achieved by the superficial method of 'doing good'. It is true that this impoverished message would not justify so-called 'desertion', and that China has nothing to learn from the West about man's brotherhood as her witness during this war has shown. Yet she has everything to learn from Jesus of charity in the service of *God's Glory*. For every true missionary, in his native or adopted country, Jesus' ideal is fundamental — 'I have glorified Thee on earth'. This will express itself in the charity that, since it 'beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things', *never faileth*. The publicans and sinners amongst whom our Lord lived, felt, not resentment against self-satisfied piety, but irresistible attraction for incarnate charity. This wise and humble book develops this theme in a way that is inspiring to all Christian workers. It shows in detail how Jesus' ambassadors must 'empty themselves of all but love' and so labour 'that the earth may be filled with the glory of God as the waters cover the sea'.

J. L.

China, the Far East and the Future. By George W. Keeton. (Cape, 15s.)

Those who read this book may wonder whether after all Japan, and not Hitler, is not Public Enemy No. 1. Professor Keeton reminds us of the sorry story of Pearl Harbour. Lulled into false security by the knowledge that negotiations between the United States and Japan were still in progress, the American fleet fell an easy prey to the invading enemy 'planes on the morning of December 7, 1941. This was quickly followed by the loss of the British battleships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales*. Thus in a few days Japan had gained a grip of the Pacific which might take years to relax. The ruthlessness and cruelty of the Japanese are now widely known. The Hong Kong atrocities shocked the world, and there are other such stories in these pages. The arrogance of the Japanese, their racial fanaticism, their conviction that the world is to be ruled by Japanese wisdom and culture, all present a very baffling problem to those who will have to make the peace. An American inquiry into the disaster at Pearl Harbour, Keeton points out, has shown that every Japanese at Hawaii was a spy. Japan's tactics can scarcely be surpassed by Nazi Germany. What of the future of Japan? Keeton thinks that it will not be very rosy. When she has been utterly defeated, she will be a minor Power with many acute problems before her. Though her population is increasing rapidly, her people are underfed, and certain diseases are very prevalent among them. Her land is poor, and she is short of coal and iron and other essential minerals.

The Chinese are a very different kind of people. A turning-point came in the history of their country during 1911. The revolution set up the Chinese Republic with Dr. Sun Yat-sen as its first President. He and Chiang Kai-shek have proved

two great leaders. Keeton says, 'Just as the Soviet Union to-day is indissolubly connected with the personal fortunes of Stalin . . . so the new China which has been created in a couple of decades . . . bears unmistakably the impress of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek's own personality'. Russia and China may yet find most of their differences disappearing in a common alliance against Japan. The end of this war may find Chiang Kai-shek with some 700,000,000 people under his control. The islands of the Pacific will present some baffling problems to the Peace Conference. Here are some hundreds of millions of people living on the starvation line. It is impossible to go back to pre-war conditions. These peoples of the East must be fitted for self-government and made to feel their country is indeed their own. Keeton writes appreciatively of the work of Christian missionaries, both in education and in medical and social services. This is a most timely book, and is a mine of information on Far Eastern questions. The last chapter is a discussion of the problems that the future Peace Conference ought to face in the Far East.

J. F. HUMPHREY

Indian Crisis. By John S. Hoyland. (Allen & Unwin, 6s. and 7s. 6d.)

How many people in this country are familiar with the term 'Communal Award', and how the voting system has influenced the social and political history of India during the last thirty years? In this outspoken book Mr. Hoyland makes this and many other obscurities of India's present-day problems very clear. As a missionary of ten years' experience in that land I feel bound to agree with the author's main thesis that the British system, which for 200 years has boasted its sacred trust to maintain unity and peace in India, has actually enormously increased the spirit of division. This policy culminated in the Cripps proposals which if accepted would have split India up into an indefinite number of separate national States. Constant reference to his own experience, both as a missionary and as a government servant, shows that Mr. Hoyland is no mere theorist. But this is not a book obsessed exclusively with the task of facing up to a great political problem; it gives the Western reader a clear and convincing picture of the whole vast Indian scene. Simply and lucidly the author concentrates, into 191 pages, almost encyclopaedic information on practically every phase of Indian life. I strongly recommend his book both to the inquirer in Britain and to those 'service men' in India who are anxious to gain a clear understanding of the surrounding peoples and their problems. Mr. Hoyland believes that one of the chief ways of understanding India is to make friends with individual Indians, and not the least attractive parts of the book are those in which he describes a variety of his own acquaintances, from an aboriginal tribesman to some of the great ones of yesterday and to-day. One feels, however, that his portrait of Mr. Gandhi as the faultless saint is rather the opinion of the Indian devotee than of the unbiased observer. The suggestions made in the various chapters for meeting the Crisis in India are summed up in brief at the end of the book. They are a challenge not only to every Christian, but to every serious voter in Britain to-day.

STUART S. LUCKCOCK

Pillars of Security. By Sir William Beveridge. (Allen & Unwin, 6s.)

In this book Sir William has gathered together nineteen speeches and essays, old and new. It takes its title from one of the chapters, yet this fairly describes the whole. Here, outside the famous Report itself, we have Sir William at his best — explanatory, illuminating, scintillating, persuasive. All the time he is the 'master', sure because he knows and strong because he believes. It is almost impossible to imagine, on turning from the Report to this collection of papers — which might be described as a commentary upon it — that anyone could remain unconvinced both of the de-

sirability of the Plan and its practicability, yet critics have appeared. Here they are dealt with courteously but very thoroughly. And Low, who has provided some clever and illuminating cartoons, lends his witty and caustic aid. Sir William, probably taking his cue from Low (or vice versa?) eloquently refutes the argument that the Plan is too risky, too expensive, contrary to our traditions or against our interests—the argument of the Blimps of to-day as in 1919. Not only so: he fearlessly answers questions as to the effect of the Plan on individuality and adventure; as to whether it leans too much towards Moscow on the one hand, or to New York on the other; and as to whether of itself the Plan is sufficient for security. Sir William is under no illusion — there are *five* giants: while he has dealt with *one* of them the others must be faced. Nevertheless, he claims that freedom from want must come first. Nor does he fail to enunciate what he considers to be vital principles in approaching post-war problems. While acknowledging there are essential liberties to preserve, he sees the necessity for the use of powers of State — planning or State ‘interference’. This case is stated in the chapter, ‘New Britain’, which deserves special study. Most useful of all, however, is the interpretation given of the main provisions of the Report, the examination of the differences between it and the Government proposals, the comments on the five Christian standards accepted by the leaders of all the Churches, and the discussion of ‘security’. Finally, this invaluable little book (pp. 212) tells us something of the philosophy of men, policies and other affairs, that has guided this great and world-renowned economist in preparing his Report.

T. W. BEVAN

The British Empire: its Structure and Spirit. By Eric A. Walker. (Oxford, 12s. 6d.)

As educated people know, and as General Smuts has said for us once for all, ‘we are not an Empire, we are a system of States, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the object of which is to secure to all its members a fuller, a richer, a more varied life’. But this is not all. In addition to self-governing States the ‘Empire’ includes ‘Colonies’, ‘Dependencies’, ‘Protectorates’, ‘Mandated Territories’, not to mention India and Eire. It would be a great advantage if we could find for this congeries of communities a simple but comprehensive designation: ‘United Commonwealth’, like every other name that has been suggested, says at once too much and too little. And there is no doubt that the word ‘Empire’, with its suggestion of ‘Imperialism’, has led to much misunderstanding, not only in other countries but even in our own.

Few can describe on the spur of the moment the special characteristics of these various dominions. The rest of us will be grateful to Professor Walker for his excellent book. His position as Professor of Imperial and Naval History at Cambridge is sufficient guarantee of his competence. But there is nothing donnish about his work: it is brief, simply-written and clear. He contrives to get into this small book all that any ordinary student can reasonably desire. After a rapid account of the ‘first Empire’, which broke up in 1776, and a sketch of British history down to 1833, he enters into more detail when dealing with the changes of the following eighty years. But what will earn him most gratitude is his hundred pages on the period since 1914 — perhaps the most important in our history. Nor would I omit to notice the rare political wisdom which is apparent everywhere in his pages.

E. E. KELLETT

The Daily Press. By Wilson Harris, editor of *The Spectator*. (Cambridge University Press, 3s. 6d.)

• This is the eighteenth volume in the series entitled ‘Current Problems’. Mr. Harris writes very competently, frankly and comprehensively of the functions, origins, influences and restraints of the Press, and of the work of the journalist and the editor.

and he does not ignore the problems of his subject. While he defends the better type of British newspaper to-day from sweeping accusations, he acknowledges that no one can be content with the scale of news values which the general Press accepts and creates. He maintains that the freedom and incorruptibility of the British Press is unsurpassed. There is a possibility of indirect influence from advertisers, but 'a paper ceaselessly zealous in the temperance cause could hardly expect much lucrative advertising from brewers, even if it wanted it'. If all is not perfect, he does not think there is anything seriously wrong. Other questions which Mr. Harris judiciously surveys are the scramble for circulation, the restrictions of the libel laws, the conferment of party honours on editors and (more commonly) owners, and relations with government departments. He is uneasy about the instability in journalism, due to the relations between editor and owner, in the event of a paper changing hands. Mr. Harris concludes with some interesting speculations as to the future, particularly in view of such modern developments as radio and air transport.

PHIL. J. FISHER

Religion and History. By Raymond V. Holt. (Lindsey Press, 1s.)

Christian Advance. By H. C. Warner. (S.C.M., 2s.)

The New Authoritarianism in Education. By L. P. Jacks, S. Maxwell and J. Murray. (Individualist Bookshop, 6d.)

The Beveridge Plan. By J. W. Nisbet, A. Gridley and E. Benn. (Individualist Bookshop, 6d.)

Religion and History, by Raymond V. Holt, is a booklet of thirty pages containing this year's Essex Hall Lecture. While it is written in simple style it says very little that is new. The claim is made that religion, because subject to the process of change, has a history and that that history must rely upon religious, not non-religious, people for its proper interpretation. In this time of crisis there is a breaking of the mould in which religion has been set and the lecturer prophesies, among other things, a new sense of oneness among men which, in its turn, will demand a world-religion — a bringing together of 'all the partial revelations men have received of God'. He pleads for an adventurous spirit in religion that release might be gained from limited and static conceptions. *Christian Advance* puts forward some practical proposals for advance and adventure in local churches and communities. Anyone interested in Discussion Groups will find here useful hints on how to start and what to discuss. Mr. Warner writes as an Anglican but is well-disposed to united action with other Churches and makes helpful suggestions about united groups in connection with 'Religion and Life'. Most of his suggestions have been successfully tried. All the writers in *The New Authoritarianism in Education* deeply distrust the tendency towards State domination in education. They criticize standardization and bureaucracy and urge the need for liberty, independence and Public Schools. Enthusiasts for *The Beveridge Plan* ought to read the pamphlet about it, for this shows how it may be criticized and even opposed. For instance, if the Plan cancels out struggle, discipline and risk, will it lead to a weakening and demoralization of character? Or again, can we afford the cost? Sir Arnold Gridley expresses his doubts.

T. W. B.

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Social Witness and Evangelism (The Beckly Lecture). By the Archbishop of Canterbury. (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.)

The Churches Face the Challenge. By Frank C. Ballard. (Nisbet, 2s. 6d.)

This year the Beckly Lecture is a lecture, and not a book, though the Archbishop has needed to add two valuable appendices. He has, of course, dealt before with both themes named in the title, but he seems to have a rare gift in avoiding mere repetition. Here he shows how the famous 'Either ... Or ...' that the Barthians have made current is quite out-of-place in considering Christian Social Teaching and Evangelism. The risk used to be that Christians should isolate Evangelism; to-day a great many serious writers ignore it. The Archbishop shows that, in more ways than one, each is the complement of the other. A circle needs a centre, but there cannot be a centre unless there is a circumference. In illustration of his general theme the Archbishop pays special attention to the problem of to-day in the realm of national reconstruction — the problem of the adolescent. The first appendix deals with the writer's solution of the problem in some detail. It includes a vivid account of his early experience with Dr. Stansfield at the Dockhead Club. Here he met specimens of 'working-class' adolescents — that is, of young folk who are just 'left to themselves', except so far as they are useful as the tools of commerce. The contrast with the care taken of the children of the well-to-do between fourteen and twenty is complete. As usual, the Churches first saw the need and led the way, but how incompletely they have met it! For instance, to turn from the docks to the suburbs, the Archbishop puts his finger on a real danger when he says that Young Peoples' Societies *within* the churches may become 'little enclaves of the pious' and not schools of apostles. Now at last, however, Hitler has startled the world with the urgency of the problem of the adolescent. Just because the adolescent is at the age when he rightly begins to claim his freedom, he needs the right kind of 'community life' in which to claim it. At last the State begins to be aware of the true scope of education. It will be wise if it works with the Churches, for the 'one thing needful' for the adolescent, in particular, is religion. The Archbishop, gathering passages from three chapters in Second Corinthians, closes with a glorious description of evangelism.

The Archbishop, of course, was one of the heads of the British Churches who signed the famous 'Ten Points Programme', which added five to five of the Pope's. It is with the additional five that Mr. Ballard deals in *The Churches Face the Challenge*. He writes, 'My main purpose has been to read the five standards in the light of the Teaching of Jesus', but he takes this purpose in a broad way. He deals with our present situation, with the environment of Jesus, and with the life of Jesus as well as His teaching. The book claims to be 'suggestive' and not 'exhaustive'; it is an admirable introduction to its subject.

Epitomes

In the *Doctrine of Our Redemption* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 4s. 6d.) Dr. Micklem, using all the great historical theories of the Atonement, has transfigured theology into devotion. Professor S. A. Cook has written a brief account of the life and work of *George Adam Smith* (Milford, 2s. 6d.). He depicts both the man and the scholar with great skill. The Chief Rabbi's *Book of Jewish Thoughts* (18 Grape Street, W.C.2, 2s.) and his edition of the *Pirke Aboth* (20 Widegate Street, E.1, 1s. 6d.) will both be welcome to the many who wish to see Judaism at its best, and the second also to the few who wish to make a start with Rabbinic Hebrew. In *Thus Spake Jesus* (Epworth

Press, 5s.) Mr. Aubrey Rees has made an anthology of the sayings of our Lord under appropriate subjects. This well-printed and handy book would serve well for devotional reading. Mr. H. W. Goldsack has provided a stimulating series of short studies in Christian sociology in his *Christ and the Age* (Epworth Press, 4s.) — an excellent book for those who are beginning to study the subject, whether singly or in groups. Dr. Rendle Short has written a book called *Modern Discovery and the Bible* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 5s.), in which he deals with science, ethnology, and archaeology in relation to the Bible. He is perhaps the ablest of Fundamentalist writers. Mrs. Carpenter, wife of the present General of the Salvation Army, while working in South America, wrote a straightforward and 'popular' Spanish account of *William Booth* (Epworth Press, 2s.) — a welcome picture of one of the greatest of English Christians. *A New Philosophy and the Philosophical Sciences*, by A. Makriakis (2 vols., Putnam, \$10), is an ambitious work, chiefly interesting because it is by a Greek 'intellectual'. The Lutterworth Press has re-issued *Radiant Freedom*, by Olive Wyon (5s.), the amazing life of Emma Pieczynska, Swiss saint and heroic friend of Poland. Can anything good be got for twopence? Yes, a *Little Book of the Kindly Light* (Epworth Press). Here are nos. 67 to 70 — A. C. Blain's *Week-Day Worship*, Derrick Cuthbert's *Jesus and Fatherhood*, H. W. Goldsack's *Christian Sacraments*, and T. W. Bevan's *Church and State*. In *How to Read the Bible* (Church Assembly, 6d.) Mr. Alan Richardson takes his readers through the Old Testament in the modern way and shows how it leads up to the New Testament — a simple guide by an expert. Mr. H. L. Gee, in his *Wartime Pilgrimage* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), takes a diversified walk here and there in England — a pleasant book for those who want to escape war-obsession. Dr. E. Stanley Jones, in his *Abundant Living* (Abingdon Press, \$1), gives a Bible Reading, with an exposition and prayer, for every day in a year. A helpful book for those who have no more than minutes for daily devotion. Miss Evelyn Wade's *The Quest* (Epworth Press, 1s. 3d.) shows how Christ is the one true guide for daily life. What is to be done for the Jews? In *Let My People Go* (Gollancz, 3d.) Mr. Victor Gollancz gives a practical answer to this urgent and perplexing question. Professor H. H. Rowley, in *Submission in Suffering* (University of Wales, 2s. 6d.), gives a very careful account of the teaching of all the great Asiatic religions, including the Bible in both Testaments, on the subject of suffering, especially 'undeserved suffering', with a very useful bibliography. The great teachers in each religion are taken one by one. The book is for experts, but no student of this pressing subject should overlook it. He will find material gathered here which must otherwise be sought bit by bit.

Periodical Literature

THE following is a list of some noteworthy articles in other recent periodicals. It is arranged alphabetically under subjects; where the title of an article does not sufficiently indicate its subject, the latter is prefixed in a bracket. The following contractions are used:

- C.Q., *Congregational Quarterly* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.).
- E.C.Q., *Eastern Churches Quarterly* (Coldwell, Red Lion Square, W.C.1, 2s.).
- E.T., *Expository Times* (T. & T. Clark, 1s.).
- H.J., *Hibbert Journal* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.).
- H.T.R., *Harvard Theological Review* (Harvard University Press, via Milford, \$1.00).
- I.R.M., *International Review of Missions*.
- J.R., *Journal of Religion* (University of Chicago, via Cambridge University Press, \$1.25).
- J.T.S., *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- P., *The Presbyterian* (James Clarke, 3d.).
- S.P., *Studies in Philology* (Johns Hopkins, \$5 quarterly).

Adventism, False and True, by G. E. Phillips (*E.T.*, July); (*Anthropology*) *Natural Selection and the Lesser Folk*, by R. R. Marrett (*H.J.*, April); *Anthroposphy*, by W. F. Lofthouse (*E.T.*, August); *Army, Religious Instruction in the*, by S. Wade (*E.T.*, July); *Baptismal Rites in the First Four Centuries, Creeds and*, by H. J. Carpenter (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); (*Barthianism*) Articles in *The Presbyter*, by D. T. Jenkins, C. E. Raven, C. K. Barrett and J. Huxtable (*P.*, Feb., March, June, April, July); *Bible To-day, The*, by J. K. Mozley (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); (*The Church*) *The Hope of the World*, by John Foster (*E.T.*, June); *Church?*, *Where to-day is the Living Centre of the*, by Erich Meissner (*H.J.*, July); *Cowper and the Unpardonable Sin*, by M. J. Quinlan (*J.R.*, April); *Cross, The Authority of the*, by R. Mackintosh and P. T. Forsyth (*C.Q.*, July); *Desert, Bad and Good, The Notion of*, by H. H. Farmer (*H.J.*, July); *Education and Citizenship, Religion as Unifying Principle in*, by Maxwell Garnett (*H.J.*, April); *Ethical Goodness, Man the Trustee of*, by Julian Huxley (*H.J.*, April); *Evangelical Revival (and Modern Missions), The*, by E. A. Payne (*C.Q.*, July); *Fatalism*, by Roger Lloyd (*E.T.*, June); *God, Cognitive Quest for*, by W. H. Bernhardt (*J.E.*, April); *Immortality, Christian Assurance of*, by N. V. Hope (*E.T.*, April); *Job, The Book of*, by C. E. B. Cranfield (*E.T.*, August); *Kierkegaard's Category of Repetition*, H. V. Martin (*E.T.*, July); *Kierkegaard, Understanding of*, by P. Marlan (*J.R.*, April); *Matthew, Biblical Quotations in*, by S. E. Johnson (*H.T.R.*, April); *Mysticism, Jewish*, by Rufus M. Jones (*H.T.R.*, April); *Ordination*, by J. S. Whale (*P.*, July); (*Overseas Missions*) Articles on Indian Religions by Nicol Macnicol, on Buddhism by D. T. Niles, and on missionary policy and methods — in India by W. Paton, in Africa by J. E. Angus and W. Wynn Jones, and in the West Indies by E. W. Thompson (*I.R.M.*, July); *Plan and be free? Can we*, by W. F. Lofthouse (*C.Q.*, April); *Proto-Luke Hypothesis, The*, by C. S. Petrie (*E.T.*, April), and by Vincent Taylor (*E.T.*, May); *Reformation, A New*, by W. R. Inge (*H.J.*, April); *Renaissance, Bibliography of English Books on*, by Rosemund Tuve (*S.P.*, April); *Russia, Religion in Soviet*, by J. Macmurray (*C.Q.*, July); *Scottish Centenaries, Two Notable (Evangelical Union and the Disruption)*, by J. Murphy (*C.Q.*, April); *Security as an Ideal*, by G. F. Barbour (*H.J.*, July); *Spiritualism*, by L. W. Grensted (*E.T.*, May); *Trinity, Development and Value of Doctrine of*, by R. D. Richardson (*H.T.R.*, April); *Worship in Early Fathers, Christian*, by Ramanos Rios (*E.C.Q.*, Jan.-June).

atural
V. F.
uly);
an.);
arrett
J. K.
E. T.
uly);
hority
The
ifying
ructu
om);
God
rance
E. T.
aard
, by
oril);
Re
uary
W
Plan
The
n, A
, by
C. Q.
, by
uly);
e of
tation

Christian News-Letter Books

Divine Judgment in Human History

By D. R. DAVIES 1s. 6d.

A new book by the author of *Down Peacock's Feathers*, and other works, will be warmly welcomed. With great vigour he asserts the thesis that history is judgment, every civilisation collapses in its turn, and our capitalistic civilization is in its death throes. A designedly provocative book.

Already Published:

The Literary Outlook

By S. L. BETHELL 2s. 6d.

A brilliant survey of the present condition of literature and its future prospects. The novelty of the book lies in its application of Christian principles to literary problems.

Christianity, Politics and Power

By GERHARD LEIBHOLZ

With a Foreword by Leonard Hodgson 1s. 6d.

Presents the views of a convinced member of the German Lutheran Church, who is an expert in political philosophy.

Science and the Spiritual

The Threshold of Theology

By T. E. JESSOP 1s. 6d.

Former Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in the University of Hull

"It would be difficult to speak too highly of the cogency of reasoning and clarity of style which characterize this little book. It deserves to be read and re-read."—*The Expository Times*.

THE SHELDON PRESS

Northumberland Ave., London, W.C.2

'Great Christian Books'

THE JOURNAL OF JOHN WESLEY

Edited by

NEHEMIAH CURNOCK

Standard Edition in Eight Volumes

Bicentenary issue 4230 pages

170 illustrations

Beautifully bound in Black Buckram

Suitable for presentation

50/- net per set of 8 vols.

From All Booksellers

London: **THE EPWORTH PRESS**

Religion and History

By RAYMOND V. HOLT, M.A., B.Litt.
1943 Essex Hall Lecture. Price 1/- (by post 1/2)

Religion To-morrow

By F. H. A. MICKLEWRIGHT, M.A.

William Ellery Channing

(1796-1842), His Religious and Social Thought.
By ANNE HOLT, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.
Price 1/- (by post 1/4)

I Have a Key (Chapters on World Problems)

By G. STEPHEN SPINKS, M.A.
Price 1/- (by post 1/4)

Can We Still Believe in Man?

By LESLIE NELTON, B.A., M.Sc.
Price 1/- (by post 1/4)
Cloth 2/- (by post 2/2)

The Immortal Soul in Danger

By JAN MASARYK (Czechoslovak Minister
for Foreign Affairs) Price 1/- (by post 1/4)

Pictures in the Fire

Seventh Volume in the Series: 'Ten Minute
Talks to Girls and Boys'.
By MARY FRANCIS, L.L.A.
Price 1/- (by post 1/4)

LINDSEY PRESS

8 Essex Street, W.C.2

Cambridge Books

C. E. RAVEN

Science, Religion, and the Future

"As a fully equipped and thoroughly competent scientist and theologian Professor Raven shows in this book how 'Mind and soul, according well, may make one music as before'. The volume is so crammed with valuable matter that it is impossible in a short review to do it justice. I sincerely commend this book as one of the best on the subject."—ALFRED E. GARVER in the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*. 7s. 6d. net

SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE

Education for a World Adrift

"Here a truly classical ideal of education and citizenship steps down to meet the practical possibilities of the fluid world of to-day. The keen edge of much wise thinking exposes the source of the trouble with sure, deft strokes, and the author proceeds to plan the building of a new civic life concomitantly with the training of human beings fit to inhabit and sustain it."—CONRAD SKINNER in the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*. *Current Problems*, No. 17. 3s. 6d. net

H. F. STEWART

Pascal's Apology for Religion

"Dr Stewart has been bolder than any of his predecessors in attempting to set the 'thoughts' in the order in which they would have appeared, if Pascal had completed his book. It is a notable achievement and will probably be the edition most used by English readers in the future."—A. W. HARRISON in the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*. 8s. 6d. net

H. G. WOOD

Christianity and Civilization

"It is an excellent introduction to the subject of post-war Reconstruction. Throughout Professor Wood is careful to be fair to his opponents, and he has many illuminating quotations from various sources. He is a very good guide for those who are beginning to think seriously about the Christian contribution to Reconstruction. In his last chapter, named 'Good Friday, 1942', he takes his readers in penitence to the foot of the Cross. This is the only place where Christians can rightly begin to study or to do anything."—*London Quarterly and Holborn Review*.

Current Problems, No. 16. 3s. 6d. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

